The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XL | NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 27, 1924 | NUMBER 508

Contents

The Week 371
Editorials
- Sanctimonious Republicanism 374
- The Farmers' Changing Status 375
- High Taxes and the People 377
- Opium: A Test of the League 378

General Articles
- Bernard Shaw Since the War....Edmund Wilson 380
- The Draft Treaty and the Outlawry of War .. ..S. O. Levinson 382
- Out in the Great Empty Spaces....Joseph K. Hart 384
- Strange Flower (Verse).....Babette Deutsch 385
- They Always Stick.....Chester T. Crowell 386
- The Dick Test.....Kate Constable 387

Correspondence 390
Nostr' Omo .....C. E. A. 391
Reviews of Books
- Law Rationalized .....Max Radin 392
- A Passage to India.....Robert Morss Lovett 393
- Plumes .....Robert Littell 394
- Rabelais and the Scholiasts....Richard Aldington 395
- Manin's Revolution .....Henry B. Fuller 396
- Briefs on Art.....Lewis Mumford 397

The Week

ACCORDING to President Coolidge, the agreement which has just been consummated in London is by way of being a final settlement. "It looks," he says, "as if the end of the war had come at last and the beginning of an honorable and, we hope, a lasting peace is at hand." No doubt the adoption of the Dawes plan affords Europe an opportunity of avoiding a disastrous calamity which only a few months ago appeared to be inevitable, and all good people will hope, as Mr. Coolidge does, that it prophecies a lasting peace. But nothing will more certainly tend to prevent the consummation of a lasting peace than a too confident belief that it is already at hand. The Dawes plan itself does not contain the essentials of a lasting peace. It does not remedy the essential defects of the Treaty of Versailles and restore to the German people the opportunity of living with the degree of independence, security, happiness and self-respect which every people has a right to demand. It is only a temporary expedient designed to save Germany, France, and Europe from the disastrous consequences of the occupation of the Ruhr. Whether it will amount to anything more than a modus vivendi for a few years will depend on the willingness of France and her associates to make far more drastic future concessions to Germany.

ACCORDING to M. Herriot France has in London accomplished several results of the utmost importance from the point of view of the French national interest. In the future the French government when it has some reason for coercing Germany can rely on the coöperation of her former allies. "The United States," he says, "has agreed to coöperate in the control to be exercised over Germany. Germany *is not required* to undergo this control passively, but to accept it freely.... She has entered into engagements with the whole world, with the United States as well as France. Should she fail to meet the engagements thus contracted the honor of all the nations who entered into these engagements with her would compel them to rise against her." Moreover, in the event of German default, France retains the right, which she established by the occupation of the Ruhr, to wage war on her own responsibility against the Germans without violating international law. "The Dawes scheme," he declares, "does not eliminate sanctions in case of bad faith. Quite the contrary, it leaves to the governments the care of determining their procedure should sanctions become necessary." France, that is, retains the right to act as she pleases, if a default takes place, and as sooner or later a default is inevitable it is obvious that the London conference has not brought the war to an end.

AMERICANS will be interested to observe that M. Herriot claims practically one hundred percent American participation in the achievements and the obligations of the Conference. If Germany has entered into obligations with the United States, obviously the United States has entered into obligations with France and Great Britain to compel Germany to meet her obligations. President Coolidge himself admits this interpretation by implication when he claims, as he did in his speech of acceptance, the adoption of the Dawes report as one of the triumphs of his administration. If this is true, the American government is more deeply involved in European economic and political controversies than she would have been if it had joined the League of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nations. According to M. Herriot, the "honor" of the United States will compel them to "rise" against Germany if Germany defaults under the Dawes schedules. Yet we are informed on good authority that none of the British and American experts who contributed to the Dawes report believe that Germany can live up to the schedules. The American nation, that is, is in honor bound to "rise" against Germany for failing to meet impossible demands.

AS a result of the speeches in which Messrs. Davis and Coolidge have accepted the Democratic and Republican nominations, the probable strategy during the campaign of the two major parties becomes fairly clear. The Republicans will do their best to dodge the issue of their own record. That is, they will attribute all the successes of the past few years to the virtues of Republican rule, all the scandals to wicked individuals, and all the failures to the order of nature. This will not be an easy position to maintain, but they will have a certain advantage in maintaining it, due to the fact that their chief spokesman will, as the President of the United States, have the mind's eye of the people fastened on him. Mr. Coolidge will not only be the advocate whose persuasive pleading is to obtain a verdict from the jury, but he will himself be the chief exhibit in the trial. The Republican campaign, it is now clear, is to consist primarily of a bare-faced argumentum ad hominem. It is Mr. Coolidge as an exhibit which is intended to enable Mr. Coolidge as an advocate to ignore the weak aspects of his official case.

CALVIN COOLIDGE is depending for election chiefly on the appeal which his humble origin and his homely personality will make to the average American voter. "Elect me," he says in effect, "and you will elect one of yourselves—a man who was brought up as you were brought up, who thinks plain and commonplace thoughts and who believes in simple and commonplace things. Elect me and you will vote in favor of continuing a system in which men like you and me can come to the surface and get elected President and accumulate large fortunes." Through this appeal, reënforced by the prospect of better prices for agricultural products, the general prosperity of the wage earners and the enthusiastic support of those business men whose wealth he is so jealously safeguarding, Mr. Coolidge expects to persuade his fellow countrymen to forget Tea Pot Dome, Daugherty, Forbes, the results of three bitter years of agricultural depression and the latent dissensions in his own party.

THE Democrats on the other hand under the leadership of Mr. Davis will concentrate on the effort to smoke out the Republicans. They will insist with truth that the Republican party as a whole is responsible for the misdeeds of Fall and the Ohio gang, and they will ask, with unanswerable logic, whether a party which claims to be so entirely responsible for all the beneficent happenings of the last four years can disclaim responsibility for the scandalous transactions of its own agents. Mr. Davis apparently intends to devote most of his energy to an attack on Republican corruption and inefficiency, and it would be an attack which under the ordinary conditions of two-party warfare ought to succeed. But in the present instance we doubt whether it will succeed. For at the time when the exposures of Republican corruption were being made, the Republicans were assisted by the press to draw a red herring across the trail. They charged people who were indignant or horrified at what had occurred with being hysterical, and they charged people who attributed a negative responsibility for what had occurred to Messrs. Fall's and Daugherty's colleagues and chief with slandering the innocent. Newspapers like the New York Times, which are now supporting Mr. Davis, did their best last winter and spring to shiver the spear upon which he must depend to unhorse Mr. Coolidge. American public opinion has never taken the exposures of the Walsh and Wheeler committees as seriously as they deserved, and probably it is too late now to bring home their enormity to people who have already been so sedulously instructed to the contrary.

MR. DAVIS will, however, have to continue as he has begun, and no matter whether he succeeds or not, he will perform a public service in preventing Mr. Coolidge, if possible, from escaping responsibility for the misdeeds of his colleagues. It will mean, however, that his campaign will have to be waged against the Republicans. He will not try to put in a positive bid for a share of the Progressive vote. He will risk his chances of election on the expectation that the voters who wish to turn the Republicans out will automatically use the Democratic party for the purpose. The Republicans, on the contrary, will, if possible, campaign against the Progressives in order to win the Democrats. They will not be averse to spreading an impression that there is some danger of La Follette's election, for they would hope thereby to persuade Democratic conservatives to vote for Coolidge. In fact, towards the end of the campaign they will systematically try to scare voters away from Davis by dwelling on the probable Progressive strength and the necessity of vindicating American institutions against the attack of the radicals. If this view is correct, the Progressives will campaign against both of the older parties, while the Democratics will seek to win votes from the Republicans and the Republicans from the Democrats. Coolidge will appeal to the voters chiefly on the score of his proposed economies, of his conservatism, and of his undistinguished, but ostentatious small-town Americanism. Mr. Davis will appeal to a few conservative Republicans

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who cannot tolerate their own party's record, but his positive supporters will consist chiefly of voters to whom the Democratic party is important and who are in favor of American entrance into the League of Nations. La Follette's supporters will include to an unprecedented extent all the discontented racial and economic groups in the country, but their discontent will have a positive significance which is not expressed in their program. The Progressive candidacy is essentially a demand by those American classes who live by labor for a kind of representation in the government of the nation which the existing national parties deny to them.

LA FOLLETTE'S candidacy has greatly embarrassed many men, and in particular many politicians and journalists who have been calling themselves progressive Republicans or Democrats. They now find they are required to make a choice which, to mince no words, is between party and principle. The dilemma is not so serious as it would be if the Wisconsin Senator were heading a real third party; but even under present circumstances it is bad enough. All the more credit is therefore due to those who, often at serious sacrifice of their immediate personal interests, have shown themselves not afraid to stand up and be counted. Such recognition is due at the moment, we feel, particularly to the yeoman service which the Scripps-Howard newspapers are giving the candidacy of Senators La Follette and Wheeler.

MUCH is said, and very properly, about the menace of "syndicate journalism," when a chain of newspapers is owned by a single individual who may and often does use his great power for improper private ends. But there is another side to the matter. A chain of newspapers owned by men who are devoted to the public service can do much better and more effective work than could an equal number of papers individually owned by honest men in the cities where they appear. The chain organization, for example, can carry on a local fight against corruption even though the enemy may resort to the favorite device of an advertising boycott. The chain can afford to conduct far-reaching expensive investigations of public affairs and divide the cost among the member-papers. It can employ the most skilful (and therefore most expensive) cartoonists and writers. If it chooses, it can hit very hard, and those malign influences which usually find it easy to muffle an isolated paper are blocked by the great resources and the independence of the chain. Of this general situation the Scripps-Howard battle for La Follette is an excellent illustration.

THE owners of these papers, which are situated in nearly thirty cities and have a combined circulation of about 2,000,000 a day, are enormously wealthy. The same pressure of self-interest is on them which impels nearly all the other rich men in the United States to support Coolidge or Davis (particularly, of course, the former). So far as can be learned, Scripps-Howard newspaper readers have voiced no demand that La Follette should be supported, though it is true that the circulation of these journals is among the elements which are most strongly for him. Yet the entire chain is vigorously behind the Progressive cause, and is giving it some of the most effective aid it is getting from any quarter. That fact is worth at least a footnote in any contemplated work on The Menace of Syndicate Journalism in the United States.

IT is gratifying to learn that Attorney-General Harlan P. Stone has followed his initial step of getting rid of William J. Burns by abolishing the system of espionage inherited from the Wilson administration and maintained in full force by Burns and Daugherty. Hereafter there are to be no special anti-labor or anti-radical activities on the part of the Bureau of Investigation. The furnishing of information to the patriotic societies for use against citizens has been forbidden. More than sixty employes have been dismissed, and professional detectives have been replaced by lawyers. All the "dollar a year" men have been dropped. No more propaganda against radicalism is being given out. Federal agents are forbidden to work up cases under state laws, as in the case of the Communists arrested in Michigan. Above all, illegal methods so long and viciously used by the department of Justice, such as placing dictagraphs in offices or houses, conducting searches without warrant, sending out provocative agents, using third degree methods, and tapping telephones are discontinued. The American Civil Liberties Union, which for years has fought these practices, requests any information in regard to their continuance, and adds: "We are confident that the Department of Justice as at present conducted will move promptly to correct any abuses and to discharge any agents guilty of the illegal methods which have characterized the system of recent years."

THE Governor and people of the state of Washington seem determined to cover up the judicial crime of imprisoning for life the eight victims in the Centralia case by a conspiracy of silence. It will be remembered that these men were convicted of the murder of Lieutenant Warren Grimm of the American Legion in an attack on the I. W. W. hall during a parade on Armistice Day, 1919. The trial was held under the surveillance of the Legion. Since its conclusion six of the jury have made sworn statements that they were frightened into returning a verdict of guilty. Now the General Defense Committee produces three affidavits by eye witnesses to the effect that Lieutenant Grimm led the attack on the hall before a shot had been fired. One of them, Cecil De Witte, a high school student, went to the neighborhood of the hall to witness the attack which was commonly talked about, and saw

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Grimm lead men out of the marching ranks to make the attack. Another eye witness, P. M. Crinion, confirms this account in detail, and adds that he furnished his information to the Prosecutor two days later, but was not summoned to the trial. Governor Louis Hart was notified of the existence of this new evidence early in July, but has made no reply. The text of the affidavits was furnished to the 240 newspapers in Washington, but it has been published in only a few cases by Labor papers. A nation-wide protest is needed to bring the Governor and press of Washington to a sense of responsibility. By no one could it be more appropriately headed than by the American Legion.

Sanctimonious Republicanism

THE speech in which Calvin Coolidge on August 14 accepted the Republican nomination for President is one of the most dreary and obscurantist documents in the long sorry history of partisan political harangues. From the ledge of every paragraph it drips equivocal commonplaces and sanctimonious misrepresentations. It is sufficiently depressing that any man who occupies such a conspicuous and responsible position should have the assurance to inflict on his fellow countrymen so much dull and pretentious nonsense. But it is even more depressing that the man who sins so flagrantly against the Holy Ghost should not suffer in consequence more than he does in the estimation of his fellow countrymen. Platitudinous beyond precedent as Mr. Coolidge is, his speech does not combine dullness with irreproachability. Mr. Coolidge's moral and political banalities always walk arm in arm with some partisan perversion of economic and social facts; and the juxtaposition is nicely adapted to the great political object of imposing on the unwary. If the American people can accept Mr. Coolidge's ambiguous generalities as significant truths and his caricature as a true representation of American social and economic conditions they undoubtedly deserve the worst that can happen to them. They deserve, that is, to have him set on high as their guide, leader, philosopher and preacher for four gloomy years, and during the whole of that period to be condemned to listen every day on the radio to his political bed-time stories.

No adult intelligence with the slightest sense of humor could have perpetrated so many solemn absurdities as does Mr. Coolidge. "I confess," he says, "that my inheritance and personal experience have bred in me a keen interest in the welfare of agriculture." "It constitutes an element in our nation of such importance as to be worthy of the utmost solicitude and concern." "A wise, skilled and unselfish leadership can do more than anything else to rescue agriculture." "I am not disturbed about the effect on a few thousand people with large incomes because they have to pay high surtaxes. What concerns me is the indirect effect of high surtaxes on all the rest of the people. Let us always remember the poor." "Our country will be better off if, disregarding those who appeal to jealousy and envy, it follows in taxation and all else the straight path of justice." "I know that the influence of womanhood will guard the home which is the citadel of the nation. I know it will be a protector of childhood. I know it will be on the side of humanity. I welcome it as a great instrument of mercy and a mighty agency of peace." "We know that mankind is finite and will continue to be under any system." "Under our institutions there is no limitation on the aspirations a mother may have for her children." "It is for the welfare of the country to have liberality in thought and progress in action, but its greatest asset is common sense. In the commonplace things of life lies the strength of the nation. It is not in brilliant conceptions and strokes of genius that we shall find the chief reliance of our country, but in the home, in the school and in religion. America will continue to defend these shrines. . . . The people know the difference between pretense and reality. They want to be told the truth. They want to be trusted. They want a chance to work out their own material and spiritual salvation. The people want a government of common sense."

The important point is that these sanctimonious and meaningless platitudes are part of a partisan harangue which urges and exhorts the American people to self-righteousness and self-satisfaction. They are blessed far beyond any people in the history of the world. They already have practically everything which their hearts can desire; and this condition of consummate happiness they owe more than anything else to Republican rule. Republicans have collected the national income and divided it up among the various economic classes and groups not, of course, equally but with essential justice. The only way in which the government can improve the distribution is to curtail its own operations and expenses and to leave a larger proportion of the income of the country in the pockets of the individual wage earner and business man. The one threat from which the happiness of the American people suffers is that mischief-making agitators will disturb this benevolent system of money-making by and for the individual, and substitute for it "government monopolies" or some other monstrous violation of traditional Americanism. Such is what Mr. Coolidge has in mind when he raises the flag of government by common sense. He means thereby government by the prosperous classes for the benefit of themselves and according to the good old ways.

No doubt Mr. Coolidge believes that by cultivating popular complacency and conservatism he is really contributing to the welfare of the American people. If he was not sincere he would not have dared to write the incredible lines in which he proposes to "remember the poor" by diminishing the direct taxes on large incomes and increasing the indirect taxes on consumption. From the point of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

view, however, of the effect of his harangue on the American public, it makes no difference whether he believes or does not believe what he says. In either event his propaganda comes from a crooked mind, and in so far as it is influential it will breed crookedness in the minds of his supporters. Intelligent Republicans should beware of the kind of leadership which they are obtaining from Mr. Coolidge and the kind of government to which he is committing the party. It is a government which invokes unctuous self-righteousness in order to conceal both from the beneficiaries and the victims of the existing system the existence and the meaning of its defects and failures. They will have to cultivate ignorance and intolerance in order to justify their complacency. The worst misfortune which can overtake the Republican party will be its continuation in power under the leadership of a man like Coolidge and as a result of the successful suppression of its collective misdeeds and a campaign of sanctimonious misrepresentation. For it will be returned to power after having thoroughly deserved defeat and without having purged itself of the impulses, the temptations and the self-deceptions which provoke and excuse crookedness.

The Farmers' Changing Status

NOTHING could be more disastrous to the American grain grower and stock raiser than such prosperity in 1924 as to lead him to believe that "normalcy" in his industry has returned. If in consequence of comparative prosperity this year he increases his acreage, incurs new debts, and overlooks reforms in the home market, he will within the next year or two—as soon as Canada again has a full crop of wheat—be plunged into a despair scarcely less black than that which overtook him in 1920.

Anyone who doubts this has only to read an illuminating study by Edwin G. Nourse of the Institute of Economics entitled American Agriculture and the European Market. * Mr. Nourse, by bringing together the relevant economic facts, sets the experience of the farmers since 1920 in its true background. A look at this picture reveals that American agriculture is entering a new phase, which cannot be survived without fundamental changes.

From 1870 until shortly before 1900, American agricultural exports to Europe increased mightily. Constant development of new free lands, for which the man-power was found in a stream of immigration, gave rise to a swelling product, which poured back over the new railroad mileage into the Atlantic ports. From there Great Britain and the nations of western Europe drew it to sustain their rapidly growing industrial populations, which had far overburdened the dwindling volume and the increasing costs of their own harvests. Their manufactures in turn, and the surplus capital derived from them, came back to the United States to pay for the food, the cotton and the tobacco.

About the beginning of the present century, the tide turned. Free land was being exhausted, the land values and the labor costs of the marginal farmer became higher. Therefore food prices rose. Our own industrialism was beginning to balance heavily against our agriculture, using its products, and displacing European manufacturing exporters in our markets. Therefore Europe had, comparatively, less purchasing power with which to buy American farm products at the higher prices. This fact, together with reasons of state, led France and Germany so to encourage agriculture that further increase in their need of imports was checked. Great Britain, however, continued to buy most of her food abroad. But new sources of supply developed in Argentina, in Australia and elsewhere, where the conditions which had formerly existed in the United States were now duplicated. There land was abundant and cheap, labor was plentiful, exports could be sold freely. Ocean shipping had developed so that transportation charges did not outweigh other advantages, even from the farthest ports. British ships could go to other continents laden with coal and come back with grain and meat. But they could not carry coal to the United States. And so, in the years between 1900 and the beginning of the World War, our principal cereal exports dropped from a five year average of 450 million bushels to 150 million bushels, pork products from 1,700 million pounds to less than 1000 million, fresh beef from 352 million pounds to six million. The characteristics of this period are usually overlooked in discussions of the subject.

It must not be supposed that American farmers prospered up to 1900, while exports were increasing, and suffered after 1900, when they began to decrease. Quite the contrary. As long as there was free land, the marginal cost of crops was held down, and before the home market for food grew to great proportions the supply regularly exceeded the demand. During this period occurred the agrarian unrest which resulted in the greenback, populist and free silver agitations. When the best land was all taken up, however, marginal costs rose. The home industrial market rapidly increased the demand. The better situated farmers, who had the most fertile land and could keep their costs comparatively low by the use of agricultural machinery in large-scale farming, began to get ahead. The gains were registered in increased land values. The city populations began to complain of a rising cost of living. Gradually there was created a class of agricultural owners living from rents and mortgages, while tenancy increased. New internal problems were being created for some classes of farmers, but on the whole agriculture was gradually adjusting itself to

*American Agriculture and the European Market, by Edwin G. Nourse. McGraw-Hill Book Co. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the changed conditions.

Then came the War, which suddenly and artificially brought a reversion to dependence of Europe on American food. Western European harvests were reduced. Millions of men had to be supported in unproductive—in fact in destructive—activity. Russia and southeastern Europe were cut off and their export surpluses were decimated. Shipping became scarce and had to be concentrated on the shortest routes. This tendency was accentuated by submarine warfare. The purchasing power of Europe was artificially stimulated by great loans, and price ceased to be a consideration. As a result, our agricultural exports shot up to unprecedented heights. Prices soared also. In consequence of this and governmental propaganda, acreages were increased tremendously, farmers doubled their obligations in rents and mortgages, and rich owning "farmers," who sold out at the high prices, retired to Florida and California.

For a short while after the War the inflation continued. But it could not last. Credits could not be extended to Europe indefinitely. Europe did not have the purchasing power, without credits, to continue to pay the high prices, since her manufacturing exports had fallen off, her gold was gone or pledged, and she had spent a large part of the capital value of her foreign investments. Instead of a shipping scarcity, there came an unwonted surplus, with rates down to the bare cost of operation. Argentina and Australia were thus back in the market. And slowly the European harvests increased, and Russia and eastern Europe began to export again. Meanwhile our farmers could not restrict production as readily as they had expanded it. They had not the reserve funds, or the large-scale control, to shut down as did manufacturing industry during the depression. The pressure of low prices led the individual farmer to continue to raise as much as he could. Methods of greater efficiency were in more demand than ever, and yields per acre increased. Though exports to Europe remained larger than before the War, they were the result of dumping the surplus on the market at any price that could be obtained. The situation was temporarily made worse by the domestic industrial depression, which decreased the purchasing power of American wage earners.

Can any European settlement renew the wartime demand for American agricultural products? Hardly. Even if Europe could be restored to the conditions of 1914, there would be reason to expect that the downward trend of our agricultural exports of the previous fifteen years would continue. But Europe cannot be restored to the conditions of 1914, and the changes emphasize her necessity to look elsewhere for food. Europe must pay for her food imports. International payments must eventually be made either in gold, in exported commodities, in shipping or other services, or in foreign investments. Credits are only a temporary and limited expedient. We now have the great bulk of Europe's gold; if she is to stabilize her currencies she cannot let more of it go, but must on the contrary borrow it back from us. Europe's exported commodities are chiefly manufactures; we compete with these at home by our own well developed industries and raise high protective tariffs against importations. Europe has already sold the greater part of her foreign investments to pay for the war; she will have far less surplus capital from this source in the future than she had before 1914. We are doing our best to compete with her shipping, insurance and banking services. Moreover, on account of the immense war debts of Europe to us, which we insist on her paying, and which are actually being paid by our best customer—Great Britain—Europe will presumably have to make large remittances to us which cannot be balanced by American exports. This reduced purchasing power of Europe beats against our costs of agricultural production which are now higher than those of any other large producer, against the high transportation costs, rail and water, from our western wheat fields, which cannot compete with the shipping rates from Argentina, against the difficulty of finding cargoes for America so that advantage may be taken of reciprocal trade, against the high American foreign exchange rates. The inevitable result must be further encouragement of home agriculture in Europe, and purchase of as much of the deficient requirements as possible in other markets than the United States. Only in case of a world shortage of crops, as in 1924, can we depend on a large European demand.

This means, for the American farmer, more and more dependence on the home market. Growing dependence was not fatal before 1914, but the decline of exports did not then occur suddenly in the face of a great domestic surplus of production. The temporary good luck of the western farmers this year merely interrupts the necessary readjustment of supply and demand, and may indeed make it more painful in the future than otherwise it would have been.

Mr. Nourse does not speculate on measures which might be helpful in counteracting the shrinkage of the European market, but it is obvious that the farmer cannot be helped either by tariffs, by further European credits, by the Dawes settlement or by the League of Nations. It is also obvious that his unrest is not at an end and that he will continue to press for aid. Anything that will simultaneously increase his domestic market and reduce his costs will help him. That means high industrial wages at full employment, accompanied by lower prices for the things he buys. Railroad reorganization which will make possible lower rates without reducing wages, shortening of all channels between consumer and producer, moderation of the business cycle, better control of supply and markets, more efficient methods in every industrial service in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cluding his own, a minimum of monopoly profits in industry and public service, cheap and abundant power—all such measures would be of permanent benefit. These are the very measures which will also benefit wage earners. Conventional Republican and Democratic policies have little to offer agriculture, but for some years at least, coöperation in economics and politics between labor and the farmers will rest on a solid economic basis. The new phase of agriculture is bound to make profound changes in every aspect of American public life.

High Taxes and the People

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE has adopted "common sense" as a slogan for his campaign. It was not a happy thought. For if ever a statesman indulged in utterances which are lacking both in common sense and in sound scientific analysis, Mr. Coolidge did so in his lucubrations on the subject of taxation. "I am not disturbed about the effect upon a few thousand people with large incomes because they have to pay high surtaxes. They can take care of themselves. What concerns me is the indirect effects of high surtaxes on all the rest of the people." What is the evidence which Mr. Coolidge cites as to the effects of these taxes upon the "rest of the people"? It is most sophomoric in character. "High rates tend to paralyze business," so runs the argument. The reduction of taxes in 1921 was "immediately followed by a revival in business." But the revival didn't last. "Rates were still too high, and all kinds of business began to pause; agriculture especially felt their indirect effects." So a new tax bill was passed this spring reducing the rates still further, and "there seems to be the beginning of another increase of prosperity." It seems that the effect of tax reduction was only temporary, and that successive doses are required to keep the processes of the industrial structure functioning normally.

One would infer from those utterances that Mr. Coolidge and those who assisted him have never heard of those cyclical ebbs and flows which constitute the very essence of our industrial process. In 1893, in 1904, in 1907, and in 1914, there were business depressions. We recovered from them without any reduction in taxes. The forces which led to the depression of industry in 1920 and 1921 lay much deeper than the tax law. The revival of 1922 and 1923 was not produced by the abolition of the excess profits tax or by the decrease in the surtaxes. There has been no lack of capital for business enterprise. We are floating year by year an unprecedented volume of securities, and are absorbing them at ever higher prices. The reason is to be found partly in the fact that the government does not spend in its operations anything like the whole amount which is collected from the taxpayer. It returns to its citizens almost one billion dollars each year in interest payments, and has succeeded under the tax law of 1923 in paying off almost one billion dollars on its public debt.

Along with his belief that high taxes have caused industrial depression, and that a new tax bill is the inevitable breeder of business revival, Mr. Coolidge still holds to the "equal diffusion theory" of taxes. The rich can take care of themselves, not alone because they can avail themselves of all the means of evasion, but because the natural workings of economic law, as Mr. Coolidge conceives that law, tend to shift the burden off the shoulders of the well-to-do on to the laborer and the farmer. It is incomprehensible that this palpable fallacy should continue to persist. For more than one hundred years all the economists, from David Ricardo to Professon Seligman, have demonstrated over and over, that taxes are not equally diffused throughout the population. Taxes upon large incomes and upon excess profits, above all others, remain where they are put. But common sense, as well as economic analysis, tells the average voter that those who pay these taxes seek their removal, not because they are shifted to other people, but exactly because they are not so shifted, and hence remain upon those who pay them to the government.

The increase in the number of large incomes reported for tax purposes in 1922 is likewise ascribed by Mr. Coolidge to lower rates. Everyone who has analyzed the figures, and who is conversant with the business revival which occurred within that year, knows that the decline of large incomes reported in 1921 was due to a failure of business profits and to a losing speculative market. 1922 was a year of revived business profits and of large speculative gains. Anyone who will examine the statistics of income for 1922 will see at once that the increase in the number of large incomes reported came almost entirely from the increase in speculative gains and losses. 1923 showed still further increases in the taxes collected from large personal incomes; the rates had not been reduced below 1922. But business was better and incomes were larger. It is easy for the politician to fall into confusion in this matter of cause and effect, and to ascribe industrial and financial results to changes in the laws. There is an old tale which relates how the fly which sat on the chariot wheel exclaimed, "What a dust do I raise!"

There is one delicious passage on the general subject of taxation and economy which gives us a rare insight into the character and the mental processes of Mr. Coolidge. "The war left us with many evils. One result was the tremendous wastage of wealth. The people of this country were required to re-create very nearly one-fifth of our national resources. . . The country needs every ounce of its energy to restore itself." Now really, does Mr. Coolidge propose to present America as a wasted country, which needs to be restored, after four years of Republican rule? During the War we made a tremendous effort to educate people to the fact that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hostilities could be carried on only with goods and services. Money as such was of no avail. Soldiers had to be fed and clothed and provided with arms and munitions through our current production. So we called upon the civilians to produce more and to abstain from consumption. Only thus could victory be won. The cost of the War was covered out of our current products, as was the cost of the ten billion dollar loan to Europe. America did not deplete its wealth, nor its resources. The War saw all our productive energy brought into being. Out of the increased product thus brought forth the cost of the War was defrayed. No part of the work of three hundred years was swept away. America came out of the War richer than it went in.

And finally, Mr. Coolidge wants "the people of America to be able to work less for the government and more for themselves." But if they will buy 4,000,000 automobiles in a year, as they did in 1923; and if 15,000,000 people will drive automobiles in a country where only 3,500,000 pay income taxes, they will surely want good roads built and maintained. And in order to get them they will have to work for the government a part of the time. It is hard to believe that in a country which paid $3,000,000,000 for new automobiles last year, and which expended $5,000,000,000 in running them, there can be such tremendous suffering because of the $1,000,000,000 which these same people contributed to the construction and maintenance of highways. After all, we are required to work so much for the government because we ask the government to do so much—not for the army, not for the king and the nobles, as in days of old—but for us, the common people. When the amount returned to the people in interest and payment on debt is deducted out of the $7,500,000,000 collected in taxes by federal, state, and local governments, there remains $5,000,000,000 as the expense of government, as against $2,250,000,000 in 1913. The expenditures of the average family for the ordinary cost of living have risen in greater proportion. It is most doubtful whether their additional expenditures in the field of private finance go for things of any greater consequence than the service which the government renders us. What this country needs today is a leader who will "debunk" the tax question.

Opium: A Test of the League

NUMEROUS surface indications suggest that slowly but certainly sentiment in the United States regarding the League of Nations is changing. The farther we get from 1920 the more clearly do we see that fanatical friends and fanatical foes alike at that time based their attitudes on positions remote from reality. Foes are beginning to realize the weakness of the most common argument, that America would be obliged to "send her boys to fight and die on a foreign shore" unless she again, as in 1917, wished to do so. Friends now see, as they did not four years ago, that the League is a very imperfect instrument, that in the past some of its chief European members have given it only lip service, and above all, that the notion of a League with teeth, enforcing the decisions by some sort of international police force, is fantastic. This League, if it survives at all, will probably have its chief value as a sort of international sounding board, to give expression to the public opinion of the world.

These altered concepts of the organization on the part of both groups increase the possibility that the United States may eventually enter the League, with Germany and Russia, after it has been divorced from responsibility for execution of those parts of the 1919 peace treaties which violate both common sense and justice. In this situation it is worth while to comment on a problem of the League which in the immediate future will have a greater effect upon public opinion in the United States than almost anything else which the Geneva organization can do or leave undone. We refer to the question of suppressing the traffic in habit-forming drugs, which the League inherited, as part of a job-lot of international activities of a general humanitarian character.

This is a subject in which the United States has long had a peculiar interest, partly because of our notorious concern about social reform of all sorts, partly through the large and growing number of drug addicts within our own borders (a number which, it should be stated, is often grossly exaggerated in the press). Our domestic laws are a model for the whole world, a model it is far from living up to. Of the several activities of the League in which we have assisted, the work of the Opium Commission has been aided by our government more directly and comprehensively than any other. Should the League be unable or unwilling to secure from the various governments involved not merely lip-service adherence but a genuine observance of our minimum demands, the relationship between the United States and the League will be much colder for a long time to come. Whoever faces the facts frankly must recognize that the negotiations which have now been in progress for several years, and will be continued in two League conferences in November of this year, have been and are highly unsatisfactory to American opinion. To understand why this is so, it is necessary to recall some history.

The chief habit-forming drugs are those which are opium alkaloids, secured from the poppy, and cocaine which comes from coca leaves. The poppy is cultivated for commercial purposes principally in Persia, Turkey and India. All these states derive revenues from poppy-growing, supervise it strictly and could with some difficulty virtually put an end to it. Coca leaves are grown in Peru, Bolivia and Java, and the industry could be regulated or suppressed if desired.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The best medical authorities are of the opinion that the abuse of these drugs can never be halted until the actual planting is confined to the actual medicinal and scientific needs of the world. In the case of opium, for example, medicine and science need not more than 350 tons a year throughout the world; yet the annual production is now about 3,900 tons. While the subject is highly controversial, the experts are virtually unanimous that there is no legitimate use of opium other than the two purposes mentioned; in other words that it is not a food, and that its habitual use by anybody including oriental peoples, whether taken by the mouth or otherwise, is harmful. If more opium and cocaine are produced than are needed in medicine and science, it is not humanly possible to prevent the surplus from being smuggled and used illegitimately. So clearly is this true that our House of Representatives took the unusual step of passing a resolution which asked the President "to urge upon the governments of certain nations the immediate necessity of limiting the production of habit-forming narcotic drugs and the raw materials from which they are made to the amount actually required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes." Secretary Hughes has stated that these are the only terms on which we will continue to coöperate.

The point of view here expressed was not however a new one. The League several years ago created an Opium Advisory Committee and this body as early as June, 1921, made a report recommending the precise action which the House of Representatives asked. But the League Assembly was not yet ready to face this question honestly and completely. It struck out the words "medicinal and scientific" and substituted "legitimate," a word which had been used by the opium convention of 1912. No one, of course, knows what "legitimate" means. The Assembly might much better have said nothing at all than to use such a dubious and ambiguous phrase.

It is the fashion (particularly among those who use the opium question purely as a stick with which to beat the British Empire) to maintain that this failure of the League was due to English influence. India derives a portion of its state revenues from opium, which it of course doesn't want to lose. Moreover the habit of eating the drug, in low-grade form, is now so widespread among the natives that if supplies were suddenly cut off there might be a great temporary increase of discontent in a country which is already close to the boiling point. It is assumed that in this and in everything else the government in India is a mere tool of the government "at home." While broadly speaking this is true, the facts are not quite so simple as the propagandists make them. The representatives of the Indian government, despite the fact that most of them are British born, are coming to have much the same increasing spirit of independence which has lately manifested itself in Canada. Even if the London government should evince a genuine change of heart on the opium question, and should adopt the American attitude in toto—a development which hardly seems likely in the immediate future—the attitude of the authorities in India would still present a difficult tactical problem.

It is not necessary, however, to look even so far in order to find plenty of trouble. Despite the fine promises which they have made in the past, several of the leading European countries evidently have no intention of allowing the American plan to be adopted either soon or completely if they can help it. One power is probably withholding consent in order to have something with which to bargain on questions nearer home. Two powers have Asiatic dependencies with situations not unlike that of India. And of course, to almost all European diplomats the American position seems impossibly quixotic. They acquiesce smilingly in the verbal statement of our idealistic demands but when it comes to practising what we preach, that is a very different matter.

Yet these diplomats are shrewd enough to realize the importance of the issue in American eyes. They know that another failure, like the last one, to come to grips with this horrible traffic, a business as indefensible and loathsome as has ever disgraced human history, will be interpreted in America as overwhelming evidence of the League's present impotence and futility. They know that foes of the League on this side of the water will seize the incident as triumphant vindication of their point of view. Pretended acceptance of our ideas without putting them into effect of course would not work; it is impossible to grow thousands of acres of poppies and to extract hundreds of tons of opium, in secret. If the American viewpoint wins, therefore, the fact may be accepted as conclusive evidence that the great powers feel our coöperation is worth more to them than a continuance of the drug traffic. What happens in Geneva this autumn will be a nicely adjusted indication as to just what value Europe places on immediate American coöperation with the League—and the price she is prepared to pay for that coöperation.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1924, IN THE U. S., BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., INC., 421 WEST 21ST ST., NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRES., ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREAS.,
DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON R. M. LOVETT STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY R. H. TAWNEY
DAVID FRIDAY H. N. BRAILSFORD LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS, CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bernard Shaw Since the War

NO one was ever more perturbed than Bernard Shaw by the disgraces and the failures of humanity; they have indeed been his chief preoccupation; but no one has ever been clearer than he as to exactly what is causing the trouble and exactly what is necessary to prevent it. His plays, though they have constituted exceedingly complex presentations of the conflicting prejudices and interests of society, have almost invariably ended cheerfully enough with a precise indication of the solution—and the preface has usually supplied an even more explicit analysis concluding with a clause by clause program for action.

In Major Barbara, for example, we have at the end a sort of allegorical group of Religion wedded to Culture taking over Industry; in Androcles and the Lion, Brute Force and Humanitarianism defying Tyranny; and in Getting Married the unknown spiritual quantity which will satisfy the whole set of ill-balanced marital equations is definitely discovered, just before the curtain, to be that of "Christian fellowship." A constructive critic was precisely what Mr. Shaw was—constructive almost to excess.

In Mr. Shaw's world before the war there were no insoluble problems. Political and economic salvation—which implied all the other kinds—were unarguably to be effected by Socialism and Socialism was to be effected through the orderly process of education and penetration undertaken by the Fabian Society. There was much indignation in Shaw but no real pessimism. And it was impossible for him to take other dramatists seriously when they wrote in scepticism or despair: Shakespeare's tragedies, for all their genius, he has always regarded as fundamentally unsatisfactory because they offer no constructive criticism of life and Molière's masterpiece, Le Misanthrope, he has characterized as the author's "dullest and worst play" because, like Hamlet or Antony and Cleopatra, it presents a desperate impasse of character which is obviously insusceptible of being resolved by the application of a Shavian formula. For all his intelligence, the tendency of Shaw has always been to simplify too much—to substitute a sort of Puritan morality having its sanction in Socialism, for the Puritan morality having its sanction in the Bible, which he was reacting against.

All this does still, of course, to some extent hold true. In the preface to Back to Methuselah, for example, he seems to suppose that the "Life Force" presented in that "Metabiological Pentateuch" somehow constitutes a substitute for that religion which he finds so disastrously lacking in the modern world. But, on the whole, he has unmistakably since the War shown signs both of a longer view of human affairs and of a deeper feeling for human nature. His latest plays do fall short, to be sure, of the electricity and vividness of the old ones, but on the other hand, if they are somewhat less sharp, they are also somewhat less cocky and, in any case, present a relief from the sterile formula of such comedies as Misalliance and Overruled which no amount of intellectual energy could make either convincing as life or acceptable as art. For one thing, both in Heartbreak House and the last section of Back to Methuselah there appears, however unwinningly conveyed, some genuine feeling for the disappointments and enthusiasms of lovers—a subject which, with scarcely even an exception in the instance of Candida, he has insisted upon regarding as a lot of romantic nonsense intended to stultify what at its best could be conceded as hardly more than an agreeable biological necessity. Heartbreak House is perhaps the first play of Shaw's which actually has any heartbreak in it, and it differs also from almost all its predecessors in failing to end with quite the neat Q. E. D. which has usually closed his demonstrations. Just as in some of his political speeches after the War and his published lecture on Ruskin's Politics he seemed finally to have become capable of doubting the ultimate efficacy of the methods of the Fabians—so in Back to Methuselah he takes us for the first time beyond the best that Socialism may be expected to do, through the regression of European society to a sort of unorganized Arcadia and to the final enfranchisement of the human spirit as a set of vortices in space—a solution which disposes of the problem of life only by announcing it all to begin over again and a triumph which must be admitted to give rise to feelings of horror and despair.

Now in Saint Joan * we get no such ultimate victory of the saint as we did in Androcles and the Lion: on the contrary, what is unexpected in Shaw, we find the forces of tradition and authority represented as equally intelligent and morally admirable with the heretic and the rebel and, instead of being left with the reassuring inference that the catastrophe of Joan—like the disillusionment of Major Barbara or the embitterment of Vivie Warren—is merely a sacrifice which will immediately bear fruit in a more intelligent program of social reconstruction, we are left with the moral that the same thing may happen again. "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?" cries Major Barbara in her hour of anguish; but immediately afterwards she readjusts her ideas of God in such a way as still to find Him at the helm of her readjusted world. "How long, O Lord, how long?" cries Saint Joan; but they are her last words in the play.

Not that Shaw has been seduced from his rôle of

---

* Saint Joan, by Bernard Shaw. New York: Brentano's. $2.25.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

social critic by the purely pathetic possibilities of Joan. He has managed one or two capital dramatic moments, of a kind rather rare with him, in which it is predominantly the personality of Joan which holds us—such as the scene in which she rouses the Dauphin and his partisans to follow her lead against the English. But primarily Saint Joan, like Shaw's other plays, is a criticism of society—only longer-sighted and less hopeful than has been his wont. Most of the really thrilling passages are those in which we feel the great forces of human history at work—the scene in the tent between Warwick and Cauchon in which the Bishop prophesies the downfall of Europe as the result of the disruption of the Catholic Church and the later scenes in which we realize Joan's predicament caught between the institution to which she is dangerous and the nation which she has helped to defeat. I do not see how those critics who have objected to the Epilogue can really understand what the play is about: if the Epilogue were to go, the tent scene would have to go, too—as would also the Inquisitor's speech and a great deal more; we should, in fact, have to have a different play built on different lines, and with Joan's individual tragedy and not human history as its theme.

Saint Joan, like Shaw's other plays, however—though in a somewhat less degree than many of them—is not free from the characteristic over-rationalizations of the social historian turned dramatist. Shaw is reported to have said that every time he saw a play of Tchekov's he felt like throwing all his own into the fire and it is quite easy to see why: Tchekov is able to have his characters convey to us their aims, their prejudices and their places in society not only with an incomparable economy which is no less telling than Shaw's prolixity, but also without ever doing violence to the likelihood of the way in which they are made to reveal themselves: whereas Shaw has been largely restricted to having his characters make out logically reasoned cases for them and defend them with debaters' skill. This is true even in the case of Saint Joan, who sometimes seems disconcertingly out of key with the naive faith of the middle ages. In one passage particularly she is allowed to rationalize her point of view beyond all bounds of probability or dramatic propriety. When Baudricourt assures her that her divine Voices are the products of her imagination, she replies all too sensibly, "Of course. That is how the messages of God come to us." And Shaw has over-explained not only in the case of Joan but also to some extent even in the cases of those other characters who may more reasonably be supposed to have understood what they were doing: the Bishop of Beauvais and the Earl of Warwick are made perfectly aware both of the functions they fill in contemporary civilization and of their subsequent places in history and even designate the tendencies they are discussing and which were then in their infancy with names like Protestantism and Nationalism which could only have existed when these were mature. Shaw says in this connection:

> It is the business of the stage to make its figures more intelligible to themselves than they would be in real life; for by no other means can they be made intelligible to the audience . . . the play would be unintelligible if I had not endowed them (the Earl of Warwick, the Inquisitor and Bishop) with enough of this consciousness to enable them to explain their attitude to the twentieth century . . . beyond this neither drama nor history can go in my hands.

This last sentence, though evidently not intended for one, reads like a confession of limitation and I believe, in fact, that this over-explicitness marks Shaw's worst weakness as a dramatic artist—his imperfect grasp of "character in action." The business of the dramatist should be precisely, as Tchekov does, to find a means of making things intelligible without suggesting to the audience that it is hearing a book read instead of witnessing a real event. To have kept out the language of written history would have been to heighten the illusion of reality, and to have heightened the illusion of reality would have been to intensify the drama.

But even if Saint Joan—like Back to Methuselah—had never been intended by its author to be acted, it would still be a work of extraordinary interest. What these later plays of Shaw's remind one of rather than of any other acted drama are the series of Drames Philosophiques which Renan wrote in his old age; these two bodies of work present some striking resemblances and it is interesting to compare them: both are dramas of ideas and in some cases of the same ideas but, beside Renan, who has traveled in his life-time over the whole geography of ideas of humanity and who has learned a polite hesitation about preferring one to another, Shaw even in his later and more tolerant phases shows a little provincial and harshly Protestant: such historical values as the point of view of the mediæval church with which Renan was familiar from boyhood are brought to our attention by Shaw at this late date with something of an air of excitement and surprise and the scepticism of all politics and politicians at which Renan had arrived before the end of the last century comes to Shaw in Back to Methuselah as the last disillusion of old age. Yet beside Renan, Shaw shows a kind of fire which sometimes gives a superiority to limited ideas over more learned and wiser ones. Shaw's demonstrations and programs and systems are probably much less important than he thinks and their defects consequently less important than his critics think them. What is important is the imagination with which they are illustrated and the intensity with which they are expressed. It is these which have really spoken to us in Shaw and which continue to speak to us even now that his brand-new, one-hundred-percent-efficient social system has begun to lose credit not only with us but with the inventor himself.

EDMUND WILSON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Draft Treaty

and the Outlawry of War

THERE are two clearly defined streams of tendency among peace advocates. One group is evolutionary, moves with caution, and expects only moderate progress from decade to decade. To this class belong the lingering adherents of the Hague conferences, of mediation and conciliation, of arbitration tribunals including the World Court, and of the League of Nations itself. The other group believes that civilization has arrived at a crisis when war must not be compromised or temporized with; that there is no time like the present and that the legal institution of war for the settlement of international disputes must be abolished, and destroyed root and branch. The latter group does not so much oppose the other methods as it regards them as half-way measures, ineffective to cope with the greatest menace now before the world, and therefore dangerous in their effect.

The importance of bringing these two groups into harmony and coöperation cannot be overestimated. After all, war is a man-made institution and can be unmade by the same power that made it. The Draft Treaty of Disarmament and Security is a revision of the Treaty of Mutual Assistance and is a welcome overture to the conciliation of these two groups.

The original treaty was prepared by the Temporary Mixed Commission and undoubtedly originated with Viscount Cecil; for when he was in this country in the spring of 1923, he studied the then budding movement for the outlawry of war with considerable interest. Indeed he wrote two memorandums on outlawry before he left this country. He made it clear to the writer in an interview in Chicago, that (in his opinion) outlawry was a mere logical development of Article X of the League of Nations. The original treaty follows this theory; the revision, while greatly improving the treaty, still attempts to provide limited and conditional outlawry in terms of a defensive alliance of which Article X is so perfect a definition.

The variations of this general theme are interesting, though somewhat confusing. The foremost pro-Leaguers in this country have insisted that Articles X and XVI of the League outlaw war. As late as December 1, 1923, their quasi-official organ urged the advocates of outlawry to accept the League and by means of Articles X and XVI secure the outlawing of war. On January 7, 1924, thirty-seven days thereafter, the Bok plan made its public appearance and sought boldly to pluck out of the League Articles X and XVI. Thus the League brand of outlawry was repudiated by the Bok proposal.

However, the Revised Treaty makes a substantial approach toward the outlawry of war, as far as it goes, and must therefore be highly commended. As all real lovers of peace would like to have war outlawed, the difference seems to be largely in the process of its attainment.

The revision improves the original treaty in several respects. To my mind much the most important of these changes is the one which puts the interpretation and application of the treaty under the jurisdiction of the International Court. Unfortunately this course is not pursued throughout the treaty. For example, the vital questions of limitation of armaments, their relative proportions, information concerning the scale of armaments, and apprehension of aggression arising from military preparation—all these are put not under the control of the Court, but under the political domination of the League Council.

The same incomplete method is adopted with reference to conferring jurisdiction upon the Court. As I read Part I, the jurisdiction seems to attach after a dispute has ripened into a claim of aggression. Of course the potent thing to do is to clothe the Court with jurisdiction over international controversies before they reach the acute stage of aggression.

Another important feature is the definition of an international aggressor, namely, a state that refuses to answer the summons of the Court within four days after notice of violation. While this is not an affirmative definition, if the distinction in kinds of war, aggressive and defensive, is to be crystallized into international law, I regard the definition as strategic and useful. But we want all kinds of war outlawed and are therefore opposed to the distinction between aggressive and defensive war, which may outlaw one and legalize the other. As Cecil himself said when in New York, "any exception may furnish the gateway to war." In 1920 John Bassett Moore suggested to the writer a change in the wording of the outlawry plan, saying:

"When you once outlaw war do not use the word 'war' any more. Do not attempt to make a distinction between aggressive and defensive wars. The right of self-defense is inherent and must be preserved, but is not war. Self-defense by an individual makes the defender neither a murderer nor a duellist."

That suggestion was then adopted and has since been incorporated in the Plan to Outlaw War, and so appears in the Borah resolution of February 14, 1923.

If sanctions are to be employed for enforcement

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and punishment, the proposals in that regard in the revised draft are perhaps the most satisfactory yet offered. But the advocates of outlawry prefer to follow the lines of the great American contribution to world peace made by our Constitutional convention of 1787. The theory of physical enforcement against a state was there repudiated under the leadership of Madison and Hamilton. They maintained that the physical enforcement of a court decree against a sovereign entity produces the vicious circle of war. The American idea of a peace program is one that puts its trust in the solemn and binding agreement of the sovereign parties and their good faith in its execution. When a real treaty for outlawing war—all wars—is made, it should be ratified by the sovereign people of every civilized nation, thereby pledging the faith of the people to the riddance of war. This would furnish real security for peace and would supplant the use of force—euphemistically called sanctions. It is difficult for the technical student of international affairs, and is anathema to the war offices, to consider any plan for world peace that does not provide overwhelming sanctions. The god of force thus perpetuates the hell of war.

But the whole structure of the original, as well as the revised treaty, rests on an unstable foundation. The preamble says: "The high contracting parties, being desirous of promoting peace and of lessening the danger of war by reduction and limitation of armaments, agree to this treaty." Note that the purpose of the treaty is not to outlaw war or abolish its use in the settlement of disputes, but to lessen the danger of war by reduction of armaments. This is putting the cart before the horse. As Professor Oppenheim in his latest work says: "Disarmament will not cause the ceasing of wars, but the ceasing of war will bring about disarmament." It is of the utmost significance that the preamble thus continues to recognize the institutional status of war. Its objective is to reduce the number of wars or to lessen the chances of war, not to prohibit or abolish the use of war in international relations. And its method of lessening the chances of war is not by outlawing it, but "by reduction and limitation of armaments." Thus even the outlawing of aggressive war is a mere incident in a treaty whose paramount purpose is to lessen the chances of war by sheer reduction of armaments. It recognizes war as an institution or proceeding that may be criminal under certain conditions and facts. Therefore, in the absence of these conditions and facts, the institution of war remains perfectly lawful. The world will have no security against the ravages of war if it is only to be outlawed in the event of a certain finding of facts. Let us have done with these exceptions and loopholes and refinements. Let us outlaw war once and for all, without equivocation and without conditions. The fetich of sovereignty seems to be the trump-card of the militarists and the marplot of international peace-makers. Wherefore we are asked from time to time to consider feeble remedies, compromise measures. Take the so-called World Court, for example. Now that it has been approved by both major parties, one may speak without political bias of that proposal. This Court is an arbitration tribunal pure and simple, wholly lacking in jurisdiction except by consent; it has no code of laws which the nations or the Court is bound to respect, and cannot even use its own decisions as precedents in another case. Section 59 of the Statute of the Court reads: "The decision of the Court has no binding force except between parties and in respect of that particular case."

The revised draft also provides for the right of withdrawal by any party. Thus again we see that the basic idea of the treaty is not the outlawing of war. The right of withdrawal defeats outlawry. Such withdrawal would automatically restore the right to utilize the institution of war, for the terms of a treaty cannot be binding on a nation after its withdrawal. Even the limited outlawing of war proposed by the revised draft is merely auxiliary and insecure.

Another glaring omission in the revised draft is the failure to provide for the codification of international law. Here again is illustrated the incompleteness of its provisions. Article VII of Part I provides that the Permanent Advisory Conference "shall from time to time consider the further codifying of the principles of international law relating to acts of aggression and preparations for such acts." Just as the provision for jurisdiction begins with the act or threat of aggression and falls far short of effective power, so the codification contemplated in Article VII is one that begins and ends with laws relating to acts of aggression. This is not a codification of international law; it is merely the developing of rules relating to that approximation to war, to wit, acts of aggression. Here again the draft follows the European and not the American method. In 1920 Mr. Root presented a plan for the codification of international law and the clothing of the World Court with considerable affirmative jurisdiction. Both of these progressive proposals were rejected by the League. Until international law is codified, we will be struggling in the quagmires of military necessity, of retaliation and reprisal, of spheres of influence and pacific blockades, questions of national honor and numerous other phrases which when not used as covers for conquest, are invoked to defy and defeat the jurisdiction of any tribunal.

It is clear that the revised draft is not an American plan. It is an improvement by some distinguished Americans of a European plan which contains an American concession. The dish is European, the sauce American. Let us make sure when we put an American imprint upon such a treaty that it harmonizes with the successful experiments of our own government and contains the great ideals of peace which our people so cherish.

S. O. Levinson.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Out in the Great Empty Spaces

THE gods are laughing again—in Texas. It used to be said that Texas raised two great crops superlatively, namely, steers and hell. Conditions have changed somewhat in recent years, and the production of steers has fallen off; but the total productivity of the state has increased, appreciably.

Politics is a big crop this year; and the Old Settler sums the matter up, just at this time, by saying, "politics is hell!" The trouble seems to be with the human beings that make up the population; or, if you prefer, the race. They are getting their cues mixed up; and the wisest politician in the state has about made up his mind to go fishin'. It's a sad and humorous story.

Some years ago there was a governor up "on the hill," by the name of Ferguson. He came from the "common peepul," and the farmers called him "Farmer Jim." But he got a mad on about something that was happening at the state university, near by, and went on the war path. He had a number of his dearest aversions in the university faculty incontinently fired, and was just beginning to sit pretty again, when some one who probably should have been chopping cotton found out that "Farmer Jim" was playing some sort of "hide and go seek," with the public moneys. Charges were preferred against him, a trial for his impeachment was ordered, and he was summarily retired to private life.

Several times since then he has tried to "come back," but has failed. This year he decided to try for a complete vindication at the hands of the voters. His opponents decided the time had come to put him out of the running finally and forever. A suit was brought, eventually in the highest court of the state, to enjoin the election board from placing his name on the primary ballot, amongst the candidates for governor, on the ground that his conviction in the impeachment trial had forever debarred him from holding public office in the state. The court held with the plaintiffs in this action, and Ferguson's name was not allowed on the ballot.

There are more ways of killing a cat, however, than Horatio ever dreamed of. For instance, there's woman suffrage, and matrimony. Mrs. Ferguson is a personage, too, a wife and mother; nay, more: a grandmother, with a grandson, "a fine, manly boy of four, who, too, must have his chance in the world." No court can keep Mrs. Ferguson out of the running for governor; and in the words of Farmer Jim, "what's hers is mine!"

Now, Texas has but one real political party, of course; and in order to compensate for that fact, political ingenuity had to concentrate upon some form of election machinery by means of which the voters could get a real "kick" out of the primaries. For this purpose, some political Edison hit upon the plan of holding a general, free-for-all primary, in the mid-summer, at which time the two most popular candidates would show up; and the decision between these two would later be determined in a second primary, called the "run-off." The election in November is, of course, a perfunctory affair.

Well, the first primary was held late in July, nine candidates participating. The results were, to say the least, paralyzing. First place went to Felix D. Robertson, of Dallas, avowed candidate of the Ku Klux Klan; the second place to Mrs. Miriam Ferguson, *vice* "Farmer Jim." All the other seven found themselves in the "also ran" class—each, however, if reports are to be believed, "with a clean conscience."

That is to say, the sovereign voters of the state of Texas will now be free to decide between the Ku Klux Klan and the wifely shadow of a discredited former governor in the second primary, to be held late in August. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that a good many Republicans are saying, "now's our chance;" and that a good many Democrats are saying, "politics is hell!"

The situation has some ameliorating features, however—for the high gods, at least. The Klan, of course, stands for the supremacy of the white, the Protestant and the Nordic. All white, Protestants and Nordics ought therefore to support Robertson. But some of them refuse to do so: they think the Klan has something else "up its sleeve," and don't propose to be drawn into a support of that something else.

On the other hand, the Klan is greatly concerned, if we may trust the pronouncements of its authorized spokesmen and its official press releases, with the sanctity and purity of the home, in Texas, and with the chastity of Texas women. Judge Robertson is quite outspoken on this subject. In his platform he declares:

> I stand for . . . the purity and integrity of the American home and the chastity and protection of American women. I am against . . . wife beaters, bootleggers and criminals; against vice, sin and crime . . . I stand for common sense; right against might, Christian schools, hospitals and eleemosynary institutions, decent, clean living; right thinking, honor, integrity and righteousness.

It can be seen that Judge Robertson is on the side of right in his fight for public office.

Now, lest anyone should wonder whether the Klan will back him in these aspirations, I shall quote from an official press release, of the Department of Education of the K. K. K. of the realm of Texas, for the week of April 7, 1924. An attorney,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. E. Myers, of Fort Worth, was the author of the release for that week, the educational subject being, "The Relation of the Home to Citizenship." Mr. Myers says, in part:

> Frugality of citizenship is reverence for the home. It is the one place that is likened unto Heaven. And yet who can define it? To me, it does mean a particular location, a house with its appointments, a family with all the tender family associations; a holy and sacred asylum, where the heart can find enjoyment and rest, where companionship holds its close councils, safe from all intrusions; the real indoors of the world; the nest of childhood where it feels safe and happy; where the springs, the rocks and the big hills are abiding friends; where young life first blossomed into reality. The one place to which we recur wherever we be or go. It is the one remembered place; the one bright picture that hangs in memory's hall. Each day of toil to make it, each effort to save and beautify, still seems to stay there. It is the blessed shrine of previous memories. It rings with laughter and echoes with song and breathes the name of mother. To the weary it is the open door of paradise; to the disconsolate the vestibule of Heaven. When clouds of trouble hover over us, and we are tired of the struggle of the day, when temptations meet us, and beset us, how sweet to rest in the quiet councils of home at evening tide, where love is monarch and contentment is queen. Though having been tossed from place to place upon the uncertain sea of life, there is peace on the Galilee of every troubled heart in the bosom of the home. Therefore, it behooves us as individuals to maintain and preserve it. What grander task could occupy humanity? "Home, Sweet Home" contains a sentiment that appeals to men regardless of position.

This, then, is "Klan Kraft's" real duty, to protect the home—a duty it promises to perform until the day "when the Rockies shall lift no more their crags unconquered to the storm, when the Alps shall break their silence and the Andes dissolve in melody, when the universe shall resound with the notes that trumpet the earth to judgment." And this is the moral and spiritual background of Judge Robertson's platform and campaign.

But the question arises: Why should not this great task of protecting the home and defending the chastity of the women of Texas be given over to a woman, to-wit: Mrs. Ferguson? Well, it's doubtful whether a woman fully understands this subject as a true man does. On the whole it's probably better that the job should be left with some man. It's likely he understands the dangers, in which the home and women are now existing, better than any protected home or any chaste woman could ever hope to understand it. Hence, Mrs. Ferguson will not win many votes by that sort of an argument.

But, on the other hand, Judge Robertson is in the hands of his friends; and we all know what that means. For example, the Grand Cyclops of the Most Noble Order of the Supreme Realm of the K. K. K. (or words to that effect) traveled by train from his retreat in Georgia to Dellas, Texas, a few days ago for the purpose of conferring with the Texas bearer of the hopes of the white, Protestant-Nordic. It was a noble gesture, calculated to concentrate all the support of all the friends of the home and womanhood and the race upon this one leader. But his gesture had a defect. He carried with him his Negro "body servant" (whatever that means) had this servant attend him in the Pullman, and permitted this servant to sleep in the same car with himself. He later claimed that he knew nothing about the matter, meaning, perhaps, that he did not expect that anything would be said or done about it.

But it seems that there were other supporters of the white, Protestant-Nordic in that same car; also some women. These other Protestants, outraged by the presence of this Negro, roused him from his slumbers, routed him out of the car and made him go to the car reserved for Negroes. Thus, the supremacy of the white and the Nordic was demonstrated; and the sensibilities of the (sleeping) women in the car were protected. But—it was not done by the K. K. K., and Judge Robertson will have to take the consequences. One authority on the subject of politics in Texas, after saying that it would not have been so bad had there been no women in the car, declared that the incident would cost the Klan candidate somewhere between fifty and a hundred thousand votes.

So, there seems to be nothing for the high gods to do in Texas this year but laugh. Some of the papers suggest, mildly, that, "it's about time for the people of Texas to wake up;" but that's obvious nonsense. The real fact is that "politics is hell!"

JOSEPH K. HART.

Strange Flower

No faint hot smell of honey, drenching
The giddy bees like velvet light;
No mellow tang of apples, quenching
The cry for color in the night;
No earthy smell of roots; no dusky
Aroma sprung from wood fresh-cut;
No black, bloom-covered grape grown musky;
No breath from petals blindly shut;
No sea-wind blown around the sunken
Green piles that knock against the pier—
Though on such perfumes men grow drunken
As upon danger, love or fear;
Not these I crave, who stand here gaping
At gardens, where I want but one
Dear odor, clinging and escaping:
The soft small scent of my small son.

BABETTE DEUTSCH.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They Always Stick

THE story was that two girls, each about twenty years of age, remained at their posts of duty in the Nixonville telephone exchange until the building collapsed under the pounding of a flood. By telephoning to every farmhouse and cross roads community in the valley they saved about twelve hundred lives; also a considerable amount of property. Both girls had previously experienced floods in that valley so they knew, when they determined to remain as long as the wires were open, that they were risking their lives. By the time the last wire was dead they couldn't leave. The water was too deep. Before the building went down, however, they took four doors off their hinges, fastened them together with wire, and were whirled away on this raft to comparative safety among the overhanging branches of a tree. There they were rescued several hours later.

On the following day a young reporter, representing the morning newspaper of a city about two hundred miles distant, got the story in detail and—as he would have said—hung it on the wire. It would have filled about one column. The story, as it appeared, follows:

"There was no loss of life at Cartersville, Landers City, Polktown, Hendersonville, Valley View, or intervening points, warning having been received in time. At Nixonville, Watson's Drug Store, above which is the telephone exchange, went down when a cotton shed floated against it. No lives lost."

The story of the two telephone girls had to be cut that day because there was more pressing news. Sixty-eight persons drowned in the flood elsewhere had been identified. Communication with several towns was still cut off; and a river ordinarily about one hundred yards wide was roaring toward salt water anywhere from ten to forty miles wide. The first news would necessarily relate to the various fates of whole communities—also lists of the dead. Heroes and heroines could wait. This was the view of the news editor, and his opinion prevailed. The young reporter made inquiry about his story on returning to the office, and listened with interest to the explanation; he was still learning the business. Then he cached a carbon copy of his story in the top drawer of his desk and went forth after more flood news. It was not difficult to find; he was busy for a week.

When the floods of water and news had subsided so that the farms and front pages were again rather dry he spread before the city editor four sheets of carbon paper and said:

"Perkins couldn't use this when I wired it in but no one has printed it. I think it's still a good story. If you wish I'll rewrite it."

The young reporter had seen those two telephone girls while their clothes were still wet, and hanging on the wash lines in their several back yards. When he interviewed them they were in bed digesting heavy doses of quinine. He couldn't free his mind of a sense of responsibility; their adventure impressed him as news. The city editor had formerly edited a newspaper right in the flood district. After reading the four sheets of carbon copy the city editor said:

"No, I don't see much to this. The telephone girls always stick. If we printed this we'd get a dozen more like it. You might take it up with the Sunday editor and write a feature story about it some day."

So the four sheets of carbon paper were again cached in the top drawer and the young reporter went out to cover a murder trial.

At the end of ten days he had more or less forgotten the telephone girls but the Sunday editor summoned him and said:

"I'm using a page feature about the men who went out in boats and rescued people from trees during the flood. If you have anything along that line I could use it."

The young reporter furnished two paragraphs, then seized the opportunity to offer his treasured carbon copy. The Sunday editor glanced at the pages, returned them, and said:

"If you can get their pictures."

At first pictures couldn't be obtained; the young ladies had none to spare; moreover they were fearful lest Nixonville laugh. One couldn't be sure what a newspaper might say. Later they sent snapshots of two groups of young men and women. Arrows indicated which were the heroines. Meanwhile one of the men who went out in boats had been nominated for a hero medal. But for that fact the young reporter might not have bothered to write his story. He hadn't thought of medals; now, however, he coveted a brace of them for the telephone girls.

Five days after the story of the telephone girls had been placed upon the Sunday editor's desk the young reporter was summoned by the managing editor and the following conversation took place:

"Did you write this?"

"Yes, sir."

"Do you know Charlie Abbott?"

"Yes, sir. I think he's press agent for the telephone company."

"Does he know you wrote this?"

"No, sir."

"That's all."

"Aren't you going to use it?"

"Not now. Maybe some time later."

"If you don't mind my asking, what's the telephone company got to do with it?"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"There's some legislation pending and I thought they might be trying to put over a little sob stuff."

"Oh. I hadn't thought of that."

"It's all right, young man. We may use it some time later but not now."

"Yes, sir."

Two months later the Sunday editor said to the young reporter in answer to inquiry:

"I threw it away. That's stale stuff now. Anyway, Perkins tells me the girls always stick. Well, if they do it isn't news. You know the old rule: If a dog bites a man it isn't news, if a man bites a dog it's big news."

The young reporter said: "Yes, sir," but it wasn't entirely clear to him.

Later when he had become a staff correspondent at the state capital—and mildly important to lobbyists—he dined one evening with one of the numerous vice-presidents of the telephone company and told him about the two telephone girls at Nixonville. The vice-president was not quite bored but he evidently had heard more thrilling stories.

"They always do that," was his comment.

"Do you ever print anything in the house organ about such happenings?"

"Sometimes."

"I'd like to write that story for you."

The vice-president's eyes narrowed ever so slightly. Was the young man looking for something? Eyes often narrow in just that way at the seats of government. The young staff correspondent felt embarrassed and changed the subject, nor did he ever mention it again.

The story has an epilogue—if you care for it. Both of the telephone girls married heroes. Mabel is now the wife of a young farmer who received a medal for rescuing three persons from a tree. Mary, the other telephone girl, is the wife of a young man who was decorated for killing eight Germans. They are very proud of their husbands. Not every soldier is decorated; nor did every farmer in the flood district risk his life during that tragic week.

As for the telephone girls, they always stick.

CHESTER T. CROWELL.

The Dick Test

IN 1796, at the time when Jenner was making his fertile observations on small pox and milk maids, Erasmus Darwin exhorted the medical scientists of his day to indulge in human experimentation with scarlet fever in the hope that inoculations with material from "the ulcers in the throat" of the sick might point the way to the control of that dreaded disease and add to the "honor and glory" of the medical profession.

At the last annual meeting of the American Medical Association, 134 years later, in the section on the Practice of Medicine, a paper was scheduled under the rather non-committal title, The Prevention of Scarlet Fever. This paper was the answer to the challenge of Erasmus Darwin. Back of it were ten years of research carried on by Doctors George and Gladys Dick at the McCormick Institute for Infectious Disease in Chicago. It was the public announcement that success had finally attended their decade of labor.

Their work has been the result of one of the most extensive pieces of human experimentation ever undertaken primarily for the purpose of studying the cause and the mode of infection of a disease as distinguished from the attempt to ward off a dreaded disease by an experimental induction of a milder form. But though their experiments dealt at first almost exclusively with the causative organism and the mode of its activity, their results have included the means of detecting susceptibility, of producing immunity and perhaps even of treating the disease. Probably it would be too much to say that animal experiments alone could never have brought results in this field; but it is evident that they could not have been as conclusive nor as immediately practicable as these which have been based upon human inoculations, principally because it has been found that the ordinary laboratory animals are more or less immune to scarlet fever.

Though the Dicks have not been the sole laborers in the field of scarlet fever research, it is they who have worked it most continuously since 1914 and in the face of negative and often most discouraging results. Less than a year ago they finally accomplished the goal of all bacteriologists: the successful application of the four postulates of Koch, the definitive tests of the identity of a micro-organism laid down by the great German bacteriologist, to the streptococcus which they believed and finally proved to be the cause of scarlet fever. From this point on, their work has been attended with fewer difficulties and with quite dramatic results.

Their contribution is unique because of its inclusiveness. They have approached the problem of scarlet fever from all its angles. They have not limited themselves to one phase only; on the contrary their studies have included etiology, mode of invasion, susceptibility and prevention, and they have already mapped out for further study the application of their antitoxin to the treatment of the disease. They stand out most distinctly, however, because they have used human subjects for their experimentation rather than rabbits or guinea pigs. Only two or three other experimenters have used human beings in their experiments on scarlet fever. One of these was a Japanese bacteriologist, Takahashi, who reported in 1921 the production of a probable immunity in his four children whom he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had inoculated with a small quantity of the diluted blood serum of a patient suffering from the disease. Neither Takahashi's nor the experiments of other workers were sufficiently controlled or extensive enough to be recognized as conclusive or comparable in any way to the extensive experiments of the Dicks.

Bacteriologists have suspected the possible rôle played by some form of the streptococcus in the causation of scarlet fever as far back as 1885 when Klein reported that he had found in the throat and blood of persons sick with the disease an organism which he called the "streptococcus conglomeratus." Furthermore, the similarity between the clinical symptoms of scarlet fever and diphtheria is so striking that the discoveries which laid bare the activities of the diphtheria bacillus were suggestive of the possibility of a further similarity between the mode of infection, immunization and treatment of the two diseases. The bacillus that produces diphtheria was described by Klebs and Loeffler in 1883 and 1884. Bacterial toxin was proved to be the causative factor in the disease in 1888 and 1889 and the use of antitoxin in immunization and treatment was established as early as 1890. The application of antitoxin in the treatment of diphtheria was followed by a decrease in the mortality in the next ten years to less than one half the figure for the preceding decade. In 1913 the Schick test to detect susceptibility among school children was introduced into the public schools of New York City, and on the basis of the work of von Behring and Theobald Smith immunization with "toxin antitoxin" has become a routine in all hospitals and institutions dealing with children and infectious diseases. The discoveries in regard to scarlet fever have a similar history with two exceptions. The first is the difficulty of recognition. To isolate the specific type of streptococcus producing scarlet fever has required over ten years of continuous work and more elaborate and detailed bacteriological technique than was available or required to identify the rather characteristic bacillus of diphtheria. The second exception is the effect upon the mortality rate. Diphtheria was a considerable factor as a cause of death among children before the use of antitoxin was established. The actual death rate from scarlet fever is already negligible.

In 1914 Doctor George Dick, following the line of thought which was pointing to the streptococcus as the causative organism, made cultures from the blood, the urine and the throat mucous of patients with the disease, and from the lymph glands, spleen and kidneys of those who had died of the fever. Among nine different organisms which he isolated he found a hemolytic streptococcus, present in every culture. But he was unable to produce a rash in any of the animals which he inoculated with this organism. His next move was to look for a virus in the bodies of persons with active scarlet fever. Though the toxicity of the blood of laboratory animals was undeniably increased by the injection into it of blood of patients in the acute stage, his tests were negative for blood and organs except for one doubtfully positive test obtained from throat mucous. But on the assumption that if a virus existed at all it was probably in the throat of the patient, experimental subcutaneous tests were made with cultures of throat mucous following the technique of Smith and Schick. Strongly positive tests, a local reddening and swelling at the point of injection of the hypothetical virus, were obtained from persons in the acute stage who are, of course, most strongly susceptible. Negative or only faintly positive tests were obtained from persons convalescing from the disease, in whom a hypothetical specific antibody was probably present which neutralized the virus and inhibited its action on the human tissues into which it was injected.

It was at this stage of the investigation, when it was fairly evident that the throat was harboring the organism, that human inoculation was begun. Blood serum from a patient with scarlet fever was swabbed on the tonsils or injected subcutaneously into ten volunteers. None of them developed any of the symptoms of scarlet fever. Bacteriologists had long taught that the causative factor was a filtrable virus. To question this was almost heresy. But a filtered suspension of the material from the throat was used as a gargle by the volunteers. It failed to produce any symptoms of the disease.

In the meantime forty-four different organisms were found in the throats of scarlet fever patients. Though none of them could be shown to have any specific relationship to the production of an immunity in the body, a strain of streptococcus and a pleomorphic organism seemed to be most hopeful. Thirty volunteers were inoculated with the streptococcus group. None of them developed more than a sore throat. Nine volunteers were inoculated with the pleomorphic organism. One of them developed a slight rash in his throat. These results were most discouraging. As a result the theory of the streptococcus was about to be discarded in favor of the pleomorphic organism.

An accidental inoculation finally turned the research back again to the streptococcus. About a year ago a nurse who was taking care of a case of scarlet fever developed a suspicious sore on her finger and a few days later a typical case of the disease. The sore on the finger was immediately subjected to close scrutiny. From it was isolated a hemolytic streptococcus. A culture of this organism was swabbed on the pharynx and tonsils of five volunteers. It produced in two only a sore throat, in two others no symptoms, but in the fifth a typical case of scarlet fever. With a culture taken from this case two further cases of the fever were experimentally produced. And still the filtrates of the hemolytic streptococcus culture gave no symptoms when swabbed on the throats of volunteers. This centred suspicion definitely on the streptococcus, inas-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much as these were the first successful fever inoculations from a known specific organism. Only one of Koch's postulates still remained to be met, the requirement that the specific organism be proved to be present constantly in the disease.

This last test was successfully satisfied when it was found that two types of the organism exist differing from each other only in their ability to ferment a sugar mannite. Either type may be present and cause disease. The toxin they produce is the same. This added the final step in the proof that the causative organism in scarlet fever is the specific strain of streptococcus which had been isolated from the finger of the nurse, and that this organism can always be found in the throats of persons suffering from the disease.

The use of the skin susceptibility tests really dates back to the tests made on convalescents in 1916. This reaction is known as the Dick Test. After the causative organism was definitely isolated and identified, cutaneous tests were made on healthy volunteers who had never had the disease, on persons then sick with scarlet fever, and on convalescents and healthy subjects who had had the fever at some past time. The technique of the test is practically the same as the Schick test for diphtheria. It is simple; it can be given easily and safely to a large group of people; it is relatively inexpensive. For this test a toxin is produced from either type of organism as follows. The streptococcus is grown in a liquid medium. The liquid is then passed through a Berkefeld filter. The resulting filtrate contains the toxic poison of scarlet fever but not the streptococci which generate it; they have been removed by the filter. One-tenth of a cubic centimeter of a dilution of this toxin to the strength of one one-thousandth is then injected into the skin of the forearm. If the subject is susceptible to scarlet fever a local reaction will appear from four to six hours after the inoculation, will reach a maximum within eighteen to thirty hours, and will then disappear. If the reaction is late in appearance it is considered weakly positive, indicating a correspondingly slight susceptibility. If no reaction at all occurs, the subject is immune to scarlet fever, presumably because immunizing bodies are already present in his system and neutralize the toxin.

In a series of experimental inoculations 41 percent of the subjects who had no history of scarlet fever gave positive tests, while all the convalescents gave negative tests. Furthermore, when the toxin was mixed with the blood serum of convalescents and then injected, those who had previously given positive tests now showed negative. These inoculations clearly demonstrated the efficacy of the skin test.

After this, immunization was produced by a bolder use of the same toxin. This requires three subcutaneous injections of the scarlet fever toxin diluted to a strength of four-thousandths. The dose is one-tenth of a cubic centimeter of this dilution. The second and third, given at five day intervals, double the quantity. Mild symptoms, similar to those following typhoid vaccination, may accompany these injections, or a rash like that of scarlatina may appear. As a reward for this slight discomfort, however, the subject receives complete immunity from scarlet fever.

Unfortunately the toxin cannot be used in treatment, as it may accentuate rather than alleviate the disease. The rash of scarlet fever was known to be due to the action of the toxic poison produced in the body by the bacteria. The subcutaneous injection of small amounts of immunizing serum has caused the rash to disappear locally, and larger doses have resulted in a general disappearance of the rash. But the quantity necessary to produce this blanching, forty to two hundred cubic centimeters, in practically every case produces a serum disease that may be as detrimental to the patient as scarlet fever.

Treatment of the disease, therefore, seems to turn upon the isolation of the antitoxin, the substance generated in the body to neutralize the bacterial poison of the disease. This immune blood serum has been obtained from horses which have been immunized by the injection of the toxin. According to the Dicks, the real potency, the antitoxin, is present in the pseudo-globulin fraction of the blood serum. Accordingly they have eliminated the other blood proteins by precipitation with ammonium sulphate, which leaves only the antitoxin portion in solution. Thus they have been able to produce an antitoxin in concentrated form. The value of this antitoxin in treatment is still to be proved. Its field of usefulness is necessarily the prevention of suffering and complications rather than the reduction of the now almost negligible death rate from scarlet fever. The value of the antitoxin for such relief is best tested at the present time by the observation of the recoveries of treated and untreated patients in a children's hospital.

Thus through the work of Doctors George and Gladys Dick the outlook for the scientific control of scarlet fever is practically assured. It is no longer a disease "of unknown etiology." Though the streptococcus as a group is a causative factor in the production of diseases with such varied manifestations as otitis media, septic sore throat, adenitis, interstitial nephritis, arthritis, erysipelas and endocarditis, the almost insurmountable task of isolating the specific form which produces scarlet fever has been accomplished. The disease has been produced experimentally; the Dick test can indicate natural susceptibility; the toxin has been developed to produce immunity by vaccination; and an antitoxin has been isolated which may yet prove invaluable in treatment. Such is this new contribution which the laboratory scientist has made to the art and practice of medicine.

KATE CONSTABLE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Immediate Outlawry of War

SIR: David Starr Jordan has defined wisdom as knowing what to do next, and virtue as doing it. What is the next step in the abolition of war?

Senator Borah's discussion of the outlawry of war (the New Republic, July 9) assumes the necessity of a long period for the molding of public sentiment. "When the sentiment of mankind has been taught to look upon war as a crime and when that sentiment has been crystallized into international law to be construed by an independent international judicial tribunal, the world will be near to universal peace. The work of educating the world to this task is tremendous."

Evidently certain nations will be ready to outlaw war before certain other nations. Must those that are ready wait for the less enlightened? Can no beginning be made by the more advanced peoples?

As soon as any two nations agree that as between themselves there shall be no more war, but all disputes including those that involve vital interests and national honor shall be settled by arbitration or judicial process, those two nations have outlawed war as far as their own inter-relations are concerned.

When Chief-Justice Taft was President he advocated such an agreement with Britain and thereby became the foremost pacifist of the world. The Senate balked as usual. The time is now ripe for such a treaty. If the two English-speaking peoples are not willing to agree never to engage in war against each other but to compose all their differences by peaceable means, then we may well despair of civilization. But they are ready.

Such a treaty would be an effective object lesson to the world. We ought to follow it with similar treaties with other nations as soon as they are ready for so sensible a plan. The example would spread. Other nations would make like compacts with one another. Thus gradually war would be outlawed the whole world over. There is no need to wait till the world is educated before the outlawing of war can begin. It can begin at once as far as the inter-relations of the sufficiently enlightened peoples are concerned.

HENRY W. PINKHAM,
Secretary, The Association To Abolish War.

Islesboro, Me.

Davis and the Clayton Law

SIR: In view of the claim put forth by former Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson that John W. Davis is the author of the labor section of the Clayton law it is remarkable that Mr. Davis in his acceptance speech made no reference to or offered no protest against the flouting of that law by Judge Wilkerson and other judges. If Mr. Davis, as claimed, drafted the labor sections then he must have put in the clauses forbidding abuse of injunctions in labor cases. If he actually wished to put an end to this abuse he must have exerted all his great legal ability to make these clauses quibble-proof. The disregard of the law by the federal judiciary must, in that event, have aroused his indignation. Yet, strange to say, he does not seem to have considered the matter worth mentioning. He had much to say of the rights of labor, he made some mention of injunctions and he strongly insisted on obedience to law. He thus touched on matters very close to his own alleged legal creation and its violation or nullification and yet remained oblivious to this vital subject. This raises the following questions:

1, Was ex-Secretary Wilson mistaken in attributing authorship to Mr. Davis?

2, If not mistaken, was Mr. Davis really interested in the matter of drafting a sound prohibition of labor injunctions and a valid requirement of jury trials in cases of indirect contempt?

3, If he was interested and believes that he put in his best efforts at drawing such a statute why did he not dwell upon its failure when so close to the subject?

4, Whatever his reasons for avoiding reference thereto why should one expect him to pay attention after election?

SAMUEL DANZIGER.

Baltimore, Md.

The Pittsburgh Plus System

SIR: As a Pittsburgher I have just read with amazement and indignation the comments of the Federal Trade Commission on the Pittsburgh Plus System. These gentlemen say it is:

"Contrary to the public interest . . . A price-fixing scheme . . . Not based on the laws of supply and demand . . . It destroys competition . . . It is price discrimination not made in good faith to meet competition . . . It retards business . . . It adds unnecessary millions of dollars annually to the cost of products . . . It increases prices."

Now all these things could be said also of our divinely-revealed protective tariff. If trade commissions and tariff commissions begin to apply the criteria of common sense and view such matters from the standpoint of the consumer, they will have to be abolished. In judging of such things a higher mystical algebra must be applied. The tariff doubles prices; that enables the manufacturer to double wages; that enables the worker to buy twice as much. So with the Pittsburgh Plus System. The "unnecessary millions" enable us to pay periodical visits to New York City, to support our bootleggers in the style to which they are accustomed, to contribute liberally to the Y. M. C. A. so long as it does not countenance Bolshevism, and in other ways to keep civilization going. Our plus was your ultra.

GEORGE SEIBEL.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

American Magazines Wanted

SIR: Some time ago, knowing that Central Europeans would be glad to secure American newspapers and periodicals, I caused to be printed in an American weekly with a small European circulation an item to the effect that I should be glad to send my cast off periodicals to a half dozen gentlemen in Central Europe who would like to get them and would also like to exchange correspondence with me on intellectual topics. To my surprise certain German and Austrian newspapers copied this letter and gave it wide publicity. I have since been simply deluged with letters from Austrians and Germans whose frantic eagerness to secure American reading matter is pathetic in the extreme.

I wondered if you would be good enough to print this letter in the hope that others interested in disposing of their old periodicals in a laudable manner might write to me; I would willingly send them names and addresses or letters from interested Europeans. In this connection may I comment on the wonderful sympathetic attitude my offer evoked? These letters are from highly intelligent people and over and over again they refer to the fact that such generosity on the part of purely disinterested people in other countries towards foreigners would be the very greatest single force in promoting the brotherhood of nations.

I believe a great work could be done just along this line. Won't some millionaire enlist and back the idea? Such cross currents of human sympathy established would do more to make war impossible than all the complicated peace plans and extreme pacifist fanatics on earth.

T. SWANN HARDING.

Beltsville, Md.

Religious Revolution

SIR: Those of your readers who are interested in the kind of religious revolution described by William Pepperell Montague in his recent admirable article The Promethean Challenge to Religion, will be glad to know that there already is at least one Christian denomination in America which has officially and frankly accepted "the Promethean challenge."

The following resolution, adopted by The Universalist General Convention at its last session is brief and unambiguous:

"Resolved: That this convention . . . believes that the Bible must be interpreted as any other literature, in the light of experience and by human reason; and that the search for religious truth must be made in the same spirit and by the same method as in other fields."

EDWARD A. LEWIS.

Stamford, Conn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nostr' Omo

READING is the most hazardous occupation in life. In the other walks of life things happen to you. You venture a flier in winter wheat and make enough for a trip to Europe. You go out for an evening's entertainment on Broadway and lose it all. There you are. But when you read, things happen in you. Occasionally, that is, at rare intervals and unknown junctures. In an idle and distracted moment you pick up a paper from an empty subway seat. Do you realize, as you leaf it through, that it may alter the course of your career? Such things happen. A certain editorial, a simple piece sounding the ancient faith in the obvious American virtues, is included in the memorial collection of the writings of Frank Cobb at the request of a New York business man who dates his career to the reading of those words. That is how it is. You strike into a book idly, in a spirit of dissiaption even, and you emerge with lightning scars upon your soul.

This happened to me with my first Conrad. The circumstances were utterly trivial, otherwise it could not have happened. I had left someone waiting while I darted into the stack of a little college library to pick a bit of melodrama or a droll story to lend bouquet to an idle evening. On such an errand I was pawing over the contemporary fiction flippantly enough when my roving glance fell upon a cover with an odd and alluring design: a mystic triangle, a thread, the shears of fate—The Secret Agent by an author named Conrad. Ah! Hot stuff! Just a peep at the first page to see if it is bearably literate. . . . The spell was broken by an altercation at the stack gate—my friend! I had read three chapters.

I emerged as one bearing an awful secret. "Come quick! I have discovered a work of genius." Rushing home I commenced to read aloud. Verloc, the abstracted Winnie, the incompetent Stevie, the embassy, the ticket-of-leave Apostle, Comrad Ossipon, the devotee of the perfect detonator, the Greenwich explosion, Chief Inspector Heat, the Assistant Commissioner, Sir Ethelred. At midnight my listener faded out. I went on. Stevie the imbecile cared for by Winnie the moron who has insured his future by marrying the open-handed Verloc, secret agent, prostitute revolutionist, fatuous elderly lover who wants to be loved for his own sake. The address on the scrap of Stevie's coat. Winnie takes it in. The fatuous husband, the moron wife with a fixed idea, the carving knife, Comrade Ossipon, madness, confusion, despair. "The act of madness or despair . . . Madness or despair."

And at the end, coma: complete anaesthesia. One goes to bed, but one is already unconscious.

What is the meaning of such an experience? What is signified? Nothing, perhaps. Or everything. One might generalize. "The Secret Agent is the outstanding fact in the fiction of the generation now passing." That is what Wilbur Cross would say. At all events that is what he did say about Tess of the D'Urbervilles on similar grounds. He had read Tess one summer day thirty years before on a haystack in a flood, or something, and reread it the following morning. This sufficed to establish the law. When he came to reviewing the novels of twenty all that was required was to find the one to Tess in spirit. Thus he could select, as the leader of the year, another story of thirty years before, The Age of Innocence. In the same year there appeared The Rescue, by Joseph Conrad. Literary laws are personal affairs. And besides, Conrad is not a baking power. "Use this and accept no substitute!"

But Professor Cross is right in confessing candidly that the source of his preference is personal experience. That effect, at least, is undeniable. To me Conrad will always be the author of The Secret Agent, and various other stories. That means, for one thing, that I do not visualize him as a sentimental sea captain romanticizing over the briny deep. The sea does not even put in an appearance in The Secret Agent. Its deeps are the incrutable mysteries of the human heart. And so even in the sea stories it is not the ocean that fascinates me, but Captain McWhirr, Flora de Barral, Heyst, Lingard, Rita, the retired Brother of the Coast. And always Marlowe, Conrad, the poet and philosopher. I must picture Conrad himself as regarding his ocean and his famous islands only as a background to the destines of men, a background of portentous immobility. Note that it was not the ocean nor the mysterious coast that inspired him to begin to write but the inscrutable folly of a man, Almayer. Note that his greatest voyage is not a voyage. The English publisher would have it called Children of the Sea. But to Conrad it was a man, The Nigger of the Narcissus! Take that, you salt water critics!

But in particular, study the ripening of Conrad's genius. The Secret Agent has been sadly neglected by the critics. Even Mr. Follett passes it off as a triviality. It is—relatively. But two years ago Conrad did it over into a play of which an edition de luxe was privately printed, autographed and distributed to subscribers only. What do you think of that? A significant trifle, to receive such treatment. Perhaps it embodies, even to the knowledge of its author, the germs of his last and greatest achievements.

There are those who stopped with Victory. Eye and ear readers. As the tropical pigmentation of Conrad's lavish scenery receded from his stories they receded with it. But what remained? Simply the pure essence of Conrad, a sense of the complexity of human life, of the unpredictability of human motives, of the overwhelming significance of the massive impersonal forces of nature and of civilization moving obscurely in the background. The indifferent immensity of oceans and empires, the frail poignancy of love and aspiration; chance, victory.

In the end, therefore, it seems to me that Conrad's greatness rests not so much upon the rich canvasses of his tropic seas as upon the delicate tracery of his lyric poetry and the grand outlines of a cosmic philosophy. No other writer of English has felt with equal sensitiveness the shadows cast upon the souls of men by a silver mine, an almost oriental despotism, an outpost of civilization upon the margin of an impenetrable jungle. No other writer has understood quite so well the exquisite unreason of the profoundest passion.

The old Rover goes to his sure end, unwavering, partly to solve an immediate personal impasse, partly because of a secret sickness in his soul, but mostly for the profound respect in which he has always held British seamanship and his still deeper pride in his own consummate skill. For the ostensible motive of the act as others view it, not at all. In the foreground love that is not love and heroism that is not heroism; in the background a republic that is a dictatorship, and an empire that is a democracy, and the brooding immobility of the ocean. Something like Joseph Conrad, I imagine.

C. E. A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Law Rationalized

Rational Basis of Legal Institutions, by Various Autors. Editorial Preface by John H. Wigmore and Albert Kocourek. New York: The Macmillan Company. $5.00.

"REASON," says my Lord Coke, "is the soul of the law and when the reason of any particular law ceases, so does the law itself. Cessante ratione legis cessat ipsa lex." These are certainly fair words and are made fairer by being translated into Latin and thus clad in the garb of immemorial and unchallengeable wisdom. Only an intemperate layman will take exception to the sentiment and he can do no more than growl out that if the Lord Chief Justice speaks truthfully, there is much law that has survived its soul.

The soul of the law which is reason Professors Wigmore and Kocourek adventure forth to seek and they discover it, or better, they leave it to be discovered, in the fifty essays they have collected into a recent volume called the Rational Basis of Legal Institutions. To the recognized weight of their own names, they add the further prestige of an introduction by Justice Holmes, gravis quamvis magnæ rei auctor. Malicious critics will say that the two eminent jurists who are responsible for the s lection were inclined to believe that lawyers are least l ly of all persons to know the rational basis of their b..ness, since reference is made chiefly to the writings of sociologists, philosophers and economists and among lawyers only to Dean Pound and Dean McMurray. To be sure, there are excerpts from Charmont, Duguit and von Bar, but these gentlemen are not lawyers in any sense that would be understood in the Essex Market District Court. The editors are laudably determined to play no favorites. Their catholic reading takes them from Hegel to Dewey and from Veblen to Paul Elmer More. Surely if law has a rational soul, some one in this notable company will know about it.

Now there is properly only one legal institution, a court. There can really be no more. The institutions mentioned in the title of the book are those relations among men which we group under the words "property," "family," "succession," "liberty"—economic and political terms every one. The power of courts to modify or control them is obviously and concededly slight. It would be much greater if there were really and indubitably some rational basis somewhere, some categorical imperative, some Idea Working Itself Out, some unambiguous predicate of the nature of man from which by mathematical deduction one might determine what human relations should be. The writers vouched here to witness loudly asseverate the existence of such a basis, but their contradictory claims cannot all be true and are not always clearly stated. I fear that after the perusal of this book more than one judicial person of my acquaintance will be content to leave the law's reason in nubibus, where it has evidently resided from eternity with the Logos, with pre-Socratic philosophy and with the freehold title of a Corporation Sole.

Rationally based or not, the various relations of men in society present themselves to law as facts and really ask nothing better than to be left alone. Indeed it is the peculiar task of the law to see that they are left alone, that the status quo is maintained. Unfortunately the status quo is a shifting, moving thing, in a state of perpetual transition from one form of organization to another. What the essays of this volume can do it to apprise courts of the source and direction of these movements.

For instance, there is Liberty, to which the book devotes Part I and one hundred and sixty-three pages, and to the discussion of which it summons Spencer, Mill, Jeremy Bentham, Sidgwick, Ely, Lovejoy and Pound. But the Liberty involved is not that with which the police interferes, but the darling of our fathers, Liberty of Contract. The phrase is a curious one for it means in practice exactly the opposite of what it deliberately suggests. It is the doctrine that when a man has made a promise under certain conditions, he shall not be allowed to change his mind.

Since a bargain often has a long and a short end, it will naturally be the holder of the short end who complains of being bound. Herbert Spencer would not let him cry off under any circumstances and would leave it to the humanity of the long-enders to decide when they should relax their grip. But even the majority of the Supreme Court in the minimum wage case were of another opinion. There were certain cases, defined and nominate, in which they would visit no legal penalty on a man who should say "I will work fourteen hours a day," and then unaccountably wish to reduce his hours. Professor Carver in Chapter XII of our book has many more cases to suggest. Doubtless there are some fine Bourbons who could get along with less.

What is to guide a court in determining whether the cases are to be multiplied or reduced? The authority of Jeremy Bentham may weigh lightly with a Justice of the Superior Court of Janeville, Georgia. What will weigh heavily with him will be whether his imaginative sympathy runs to those who habitually make disadvantageous bargains or to those who induce others to make them. The basis of his decision is necessarily his sense of direction and the test of rationality is whether it is the direction in which he desires to move.

The 300 pages devoted to property and succession invite the same comment. Points of view bristle like quills on a porcupine. No less than four essays come from Bishop Gore's book, Property, which, with downright Socialists, with Tawney, Veblen, Hobson and others, give "advanced" views a fully adequate representation. And all the views, advanced or retrograde, cancroid or merely stationary, proclaim a rational basis for themselves, if an abstract formula is such a basis.

But though derived from a scholastic term hardly more substantial than quiddity, property is fairly concrete at the present day. That is a man's property which he encloses from his neighbors. The hall mark of the institution is the sign "Trespassers will be prosecuted." And yet the course of social development is a fluctuating series of attempts to trespass on the enclosure. With a capital levy operative in Czechoslovakia and threatened in England, pallid gentlemen may ask where this sort of thing is likely to end. Mr. Paul Elmer More literally shudders on page 314 at what will happen when "predominant rights from property acquired are transferred to the labor by which it is produced." To Mr. Veblen, on the other hand, the vested rights that enable Mr. More t the seclusion of Shelbourne come from the obtaining something for nothing—an ancient always so politely paraphrased. All the write

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taxis are expensive and street car always full, is limited by the yards he can walk, and the few dollars that a cripple can earn, and whose every hour seems not to be without its passionate, bitter resentment at the men and the things which so imprisoned him. Life for Plume is a sort of solitary confinement, an angry narrow cell in which his only companions are raillery and a curious mixture of courage and self-pity, companions so constant that in the end the reader cries aloud with Richard's wife: "The sooner you cease to think of yourself the happier you will be." But he cannot stop thinking of himself, which, even more than the pain and hampered life is the curse of the maimed and crippled.

His hero's sufferings and irritation are so all absorbing that even their author is terribly absorbed by them as well, so that the story moves in a bitterly, pitilessly narrow groove. Which lends the book its curious mixture of the horribly real and the strangely unreal. A pain or obsession, we are forced to say to ourselves, which can so twist and alter and subject to itself the rest of the world, must be a very real pain indeed. Only the whole in mind and body can afford not to be egocentric. Only a book which did not aim exclusively at telling you and me what war is like to people who were really hit by it could afford to be more various, and casual, and easy-going, and humorous, and interesting.

Plumes could be more interesting, but it would lose its hammer-like reiteration of the fact that when a man has gone to war and lost a leg which, for all he knows, he might just as usefully have lost under a freight train, he suffers, not once, but all the time, not in one way, but in all sorts of ways, from slipping on the ice to living in small cheap apartments where he is forced to notice his wife's suffering too, and her tired face, and the garbage which must be removed, and her hands—"Naphtha soap had shrunk them, the brush had rubbed and blistered them, the rust and dripping from the grill on the hot plate had stained them a dull iron color and grimed their texture."

No wonder he "kissed them fatuously, brokenly." No wonder that from this furnished room and privation their only defense was "a tender, strained sentimentality that included readings from poetry and a thousand recollections of walks" together in happier days. No wonder that Richard, who was "fed on a diet of shining swords when he was young," and therefore lost a leg, is full of a bitterness hard for the two-legged to understand. He listens to his friend, Gary (another war cripple, who throughout the book is the spokesman of some of the bitterest and most unanswerable cursing of war I have read anywhere), and must agree with him that war is "simply a business of saying 'Here, we can't agree; but I'll cut your arm off and you'll cut mine off and then we'll go home and rear some children, hoping to God they'll be born with two arms.'"

If Plumes, by reason of its narrowness, its singleness of suffering, is not an interesting book, nor its characters very real, except in that core of themselves which feels and suffers really deeply, it is far harder to forget than many a more interesting book. And the interesting books about war are the books which do not stir people up to prevent more wars about which more "interesting" books will be written. Plumes, since it is an almost undiluted record of personal anguish so absorbing and terrible as easily to affect the reader, is the kind of book that makes wars permanently less interesting.

The best way to spend September 12th is to stay away from the Brass Band and the Boys in Khaki, and read Plumes instead.

ROBERT LITTELL.

Rabelais and the Scholiasts

The Engima of Rabelais: an Essay in Interpretation, by A. F. Chappell. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

"RABELAIS'S purpose," says Mr. Chappell at the beginning of his book, "has been most variously interpreted." It has indeed. People in the sixteenth century read Rabelais because he amused them (which is still the best reason for reading him); in the seventeenth century La Bruyère considered him "an enigma," and La Harpe in the eighteenth century informs us that many persons thought Rabelais mad —*insensé*. At the Revolution the great inchoate "novel" was held to be a satire on monarchy; during the Romantic period it was interpreted as the *chronique scandaleuse* of its age, as an apology for the Reformation, as philosophic and social temerities hidden beneath a mask. Charles Kingsley informs us that "Rabelais hid the light of his genius under a dung-hill." Sainte-Beuve interested himself in Rabelais's theories of education. More recently, Professor Abel Lefranc, M. Plattard, Mr. W. F. Smith, M. Sébillot, Professor Villey and Mr. Tilley—to name a few only—have given us their views or the results of their researches. Professor Lefranc founded a Revue des Etudes Rabelaissiennes, which has run unquenchably for years. While these modern "scientific" or "comparatist" critics are agreed in some respects, they differ in others, and contradict each other obstinately and exultantly; as witness Professor Villey's footnotes about Mr. Tilley. Since the subject is very complicated, and not a little controversial; since most of these books are long and generally argumentative; and since His Holiness has never pronounced *ex cathedra* on the matter; the plain man who takes his Rabelais as it comes is apt to be in a high state of bewilderment and dismay at this prodigious outflow of learning. He may even become angry and mutter something about "Sorbonagres," and hope that forty thousand cartloads of devils may carry off the scholiasts to the place where (as Rabelais informs us) Pope Julius is 'a crier of pudding-pies," but has "left off wearing his great buggerly beard."

The plain man interested in Rabelais may do well to subdue his impatience and give his attention to expert scholars who, if not infallible, assuredly know more about the matter than he does; but he has certain prejudices which scholiasts might condescend to notice. He holds that a permanent work of creative imagination needs no interpretation, and thinks with horror of erudite interpretations of A Midsummer Night's Dream and Pickwick Papers; that a dull book about an interesting book is a literary crime; that a multitude of painstaking books about books is the surest method of creating a dislike for literature; that the most fatal thing which can happen to an imaginative author is to become the prey of "experts" who make his books a framework for their ingenious and complex game, and pounce angrily on any outsider who refuses to observe the rules. And it is a fact that the chief effect of "scientific" literary criticism upon the plain man is to make him desirous of burning his books and becoming a noble savage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The most remarkable fact about The Enigma of Rabelais is that a book so formal, so earnest, so unsmiling, could emerge as a by-product of the fantastic imaginations and mirth of Gargantua and Pantagruel. It may be presumed that Mr. Chappell enjoys his Rabelais in weaker moments as much as we of the more ignorant sort, but with rare self-denial he has prevented any of that enjoyment from entering his book. In writing The Enigma of Rabelais Mr. Chappell must have had his nose pretty frequently into the pages of a book whose *verve* is so infectious that, after reading it, most people find their pens begin to frisk and flirt and run away with their solemnity. Mr. Chappell's prose plods on with unswerving monotony, and is only lavish in "somewhats," "therefores," "howevers," and the like.

The "interpretation" is hardly an interpretation at all. In effect, what it propounds is that Rabelais developed intellectually and spiritually as he grew older, and gained more experience of the world; that he expressed in his book many of his views on philosophy, religion, society, education, learning; and that the views expressed in the Tiers Livre and Quart Livre often differ greatly from those in the two earlier books—not a very astounding fact, considering the lapse of time between the second and third books, and the new experience of men and affairs absorbed by Rabelais in Italy and from his association with the Cardinal du Bellay and at Court. It is obvious that the happy escaped monk and young doctor who wrote the first two books was a different person from the man of the world who wrote the others. The "enigma" would seem to resolve itself into the fact that the book was composed at different periods of the life of a man whose views changed as he grew older, "a supposition," as Mr. Chappell sagely remarks, "not out of keeping with observed developments of the human mind even later in an individual's life." Whether these undoubted facts are a solid enough basis for the creation of Mr. Chappell's earnest and didactic Rabelais may admit a query. For example, can we say that the phrase "calme et grande mere la terre" means that Rabelais "combined a sense of mystery with a passionate love of the earth"? Are we greatly enlightened by being told that "much of his [Rabelais's] humor throughout depends upon an ingenious play upon words and phrases," and that his "fertile invention . . . wilfully envelops earnest matter in the most ridiculous buffoonery"? And why does Mr. Chappell unnecessarily and inaccurately romanticize Pantagruel by saying: "Although in the storm-scene we are interested in Friar John's activity and amused by Panurge's terror, we never lose sight of the quiet, dignified leader whose place is *at the helm*"; when Rabelais says that by the pilot's advice Pantagruel firmly grasped the *mast*—"par l'advis du pilot *l'arbre* fort et ferme"? Has Mr. Chappell no sense of humor?

There are two obvious and important facts to realize about Rabelais. One is that he was a humorous, imaginative, and creative artist of the first order; the other, that he was one of the world's really civilized and enlightened men, warring against superstition, violence, pendantry, ignorance, and oppression. Those two propositions can be enlarged and modified with an immense amount of detail, but no ingenuity can transform the very human Rabelais who enjoyed bawdy jests and the rattle of pottle-pots into a didatic and solemn "teacher."

RICHARD ALDINGTON.

Manin's Revolution

Manin and the Venetian Revolution, 1848, by George Macaulay Trevelyan. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. $4.50.

A ONE-MAN revolution suggests biography rather than history. M. Trevelyan has recognized this in the very arrangement of his title. Here, as in his various preceding volumes on Garibaldi, the protagonist is well to the front, and the historic happenings are ranged round and behind him. Manin was the revolution. Though the Venice of 1848 was far from being the supine, abject thing that was snuffed out by Bonaparte half a century earlier, yet the Venetian aristocracy, unlike that of Milan in the same revolutionary year, contributed little to the movement: the strength of that came from the confidence which the middle and lower orders reposed in Manin personally. On the whole—though showing some error in judgment—he deserved it: he "cooked the latent spirit of Venetia, in which so many patriots had refused to believe." But in order to rouse the Venetians he was obliged to proclaim the Republic—a revival of its millenial predecessor; and such a course made difficulties with Piedmont and France, the two hopes of Venice against the Austrian tyranny. Also, he failed to deal adequately with the Imperial fleet stationed at the head of the Adriatic; and it was the bombardment from this fleet which, after a year and a half of republican government, put an end, temporarily, to the hopes of Venice and of her dictator.

Thus, regrettably, an opportunity was lost. Our author still retains to the full the British belief in the efficacy of the British form of government for Continental peoples and their ills: "It was a moment when Parliamentary institutions and free political life might have been established on the Continent in time to become acclimatized before the social questions and class divisions of modern industrialism became unfavourably acute."

Yet, after all, the revolutionary movement of the forties, if not the full success of that in the sixties, was far from being the total failure of that in the twenties. It brought together the cities, noticeably Venice and Milan; and, as the author acutely observes, "it was the voluntary union of the cities of Italy that made the movement of the Risorgimento." More specifically, it was the project for a railway between these two cities which helped draw them together, and which gave Manin some of his best and earliest experiences in public life. Vienna would permit no activity that possessed political significance, but would not too much impede an enterprise that appeared to be commercial. Manin, up to 1840 a practising lawyer and nothing more, now took a leading part in the railway question. It was this, as much as any other single consideration, which put him at the head of Venice's political concerns. The land campaigns in the warfare between Venice and Austria were fought out in large part on the Piave, like the more recent campaigns of 1918; and it is interesting to recall that Mr. Trevelyan's preceding book, dated 1919, again goes over this historic ground. It was, in fact, too good a chance for one of the most intelligently Italianate of Englishmen to overlook. Trevelyan writes on Italian themes out of a great love and an immense competency. The monumental bibliography which accompanies the present volume shows the extent and closeness of his studies. Obviously it was not constructed merely to make a fine showing: throughout it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leaves evidences of the most familiar use. As a record of one of the minor phases in the long course of Italian unification, this book and its bibliography will probably stand for the final, sufficing word.

HENRY B. FULLER.

Briefs on Art

Southern Baroque Art: A Study of Painting, Architecture and Music in Italy and Spain of the 17th & 18th Centuries, by Sacheverell Sitwell. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $6.00.

SOUTHERN Baroque Art is an attempt to recreate certain aspects of the Southern culture and civilisation of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in Mexico as well as in Spain and Italy: it pictures that gaudy, hectic, extravagant dance of amateurs which—with tightened laces and mincing steps—marched decorously into the Victorian period of the Northern countries. Nearer to us than any of the greater epochs of art, the Baroque has been for this reason the object of contempt and misunderstanding, and Mr. Sitwell's book adds bravely to the growing literature which seeks to place the Baroque in a more sympathetic light.

The artists and architects of the Baroque made a religion of gaiety: with the same smile, with the same bright tunes and amiable colors and proliferating ornament, they approached a church, a monastery, a palace, or, for that matter, a cemetery. No other art exhibits a more complete absence of the austere virtues: no other art sticks a more impudent tongue out at sincerity: no other art belongs more completely to the pastrycook. Mr. Sitwell has written a tribute to the period which is itself Baroque; his chapters are thick with information, incident, description, interpretation; but somehow they have the exuberant pointlessness of Baroque architecture itself, and one is not quite sure whether he wrote as a lover of Baroque art, as a literary historian, or as one who merely wished to handle a theme which called for rich embroidery. To those who enjoy the Baroque this characterization will make Mr. Sitwell's book seem doubly commendable; and I mean that it should; for Mr. Sitwell's gifts and his theme are happily wedded. It is a uniquely good book on a uniquely interesting episode in the European mind.

Living Painters: Duncan Grant, with an introduction by Roger Fry. London: The Hogarth Press. 8s. 6d.

THESE twenty-four black and white reproductions, with a little essay by Roger Fry, are a welcome introduction to the work of Mr. Grant. As with his contemporary, Mr. Nevinson, one sees in Mr. Grant's work, not the firm and unhesitating inner movement of Mr. Wyndham Lewis, but rather the deliberate playing about with themes and methods, now with a touch of Augustus John, now with a hint of Derain or Cézanne, now influenced—as in The Tightrope Walker—by Seurat, or finally falling back into the solid English landscape tradition of the eighteenth century water-colorists. There is a color facsimile of one of Mr. Grant's pictures in the Dial's Folio of Living Art; but one surmises that it is neither for color nor for formal design that Mr. Grant's work is highly prized; but rather for a certain decorative grace and vivacity best seen, perhaps, in his Decoration on a Cupboard, or in his background for a Venetian ballet.

The Outline of Art, edited by Sir William Orpen; illustrated. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $4.50.

SIR WILLIAM ORPEN'S Outline of Art has just the opposite virtues of the Outline of Literature. For a synopsis of art, the reproductions are distinctly second-rate, and the values of the color-reproductions are quite as false as those of the tepid brown ink monotones. On the other hand, the text abounds in anecdotes, which are the marginalia of criticism, and with no pretence at getting behind the most obvious of "personalities" it has at least the virtue of honesty. The amount of attention devoted to the second-rate Victorians and to British official war artists would be ludicrous were the volumes not directed towards a British public. The comparative neglect of France and the absolute neglect of post-reformation Germany, of Russia, of the United States, plainly derive from the same bias. It should be added that "Art" in the title means painting alone.

The Necessity of Art, by A. Clutton Brock, Percy Dearmer, A. S. Duncan-Jones, J. Middleton Murry, A. W. Pollard, and Malcolm Spencer. New York: George H. Doran Co. $3.00.

THIS is a symposium on the importance of art by a group that would restore art to its ancient, central position as a handmaiden to religion. It is headed by an excellent essay on Art and the Escape from Banality, which lacks nothing but a sufficient conclusion; and its discussions of the Church's attitude towards art, of the Puritan's objection to it, and on the relation of literature and religion show a freshness of interest which derives from the personality of the writers. None of the contributors, however, has quite faced the critical difficulty of coupling art with religion—the difficulty that religion itself has alas! been pushed towards the periphery of life.

LEWIS MUMFORD.

Contributors

EDMUND WILSON, journalist and critic, was formerly on the editorial staff of Vanity Fair, and later of the New Republic.

S. O. LEVINSON is a prominent Chicago attorney, and the originator of the outlawry of war movement.

JOSEPH K. HART was formerly professor of education at Reed College and the University of Washington. He is the author of Democracy in Education, Community Organization, and Social Life and Institutions.

BABETTE DEUTSCH, frequent contributor of poetry to current periodicals, is the author of Banners, a volume of poems, and co-translator of Modern Russian Poetry, An Anthology.

CHESTER T. CROWELL, a newspaper man for a number of years and formerly an editorial writer for the New York Evening Post, is a contributor of stories and articles to current publications.

KATE CONSTABLE is a senior in Rush Medical College and author of a monograph on Dispensary Patients published by the Central Free Dispensary of Chicago.

MAX RADIN, professor of law at the University of California, is author of Legislation of The Greeks and Romans on Corporation.

RICHARD ALDINGTON is a contributor to the London Nation.

LEWIS MUMFORD is the author of The Story of the Utopias.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROSPECT HILL APARTMENTS

41st STREET AND PROSPECT PLACE

100% Co-operative

ON the highest point in midtown New York; ground floor on a level with sixth floor in Washington Square district; within 10 minutes' walk of Grand Central Station.

Decorations of apartments and fixtures included in the sales price. Apartments will consist of 2 to 4 rooms or larger combinations. Fireplaces, chemical refrigeration, incinerators, etc. Occupancy Spring of 1925. References required. Send for complete plans.

HAMILTON, ISELIN & CO.
SELLING AGENTS
385 Madison Avenue, Murray Hill 7660

The School of Opinion

Tavern-on-the-Moors, Siasconset, Nantucket Island, Mass.

September 1 - 18

Philosophy, Literature, Drama, Politics, International Relations

The Sconset Moors

Speakers:

Walton H. Hamilton, Institute of Economics, Washington, D. C.
Sinclair Lewis, Novelist.
Lewis Gannett, Editor "The Nation."
Everett Dean Martin, People's Institute, New York.
Horace M. Kallen, Lecturer on Psychology, New School for Social Research, New York.
Dr. Albert L. Crane, Chief Psychologist, Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago.
H. W. L. Dana, Lecturer on Drama, New School for Social Research, New York.
Max Merz, Director Elizabeth Duncan School, Berlin and New York.
Frederic C. Howe, Publicist.

Special rates at the Tavern.

FREDERIC C. HOWE, *Director* Siasconset, Massachusetts

DOES YOUR CHILD FAIL TO CONCENTRATE?

This fault is often found in super-gifted children, due to lack of interest in routine work.

Our progressive methods, our small classes, and our understanding teachers, enable us to attain unusual success with such children.

A Country Day School of the **progressive, new education** type, with small boarding department under ideal home conditions for children under sixteen, located in WASHINGTON'S loveliest suburb.

Chevy Chase Country Day School

Dept. B, Chevy Chase, Md.

Director, Stanwood Cobb, Harvard A. M.

WHY I LEFT THE CHURCH

In his amazing confession, "Why I Left the Church," Joseph McCabe, one of the world's most eminent scholars, tells why, after 20 years as a Jesuit, he foreswore Rome. Why he is now "branded as a criminal" by the church and ostracized by his friends makes this document one of vital importance to every thinking person. Send 25c for your copy.

Eugenics Publishing Co., 1658 Broadway Dept. 18 New York City

Rights!

This is the age of rights: rights for men (of course), rights for women, rights for children, rights for this, rights for that, rights for everything under the sun. Rights! Well, what does it all mean? It means, simply, it seems, that somehow we sense we have no real rights at all—that rights just cancel rights.

How can it be otherwise when rights as our own actions show always consist of the right to deny them? Until rights become as much a matter of "not doing" as "doing" (perhaps even more) we shall have no rights. We can make them so only through a common creed or understanding based on common sense.

Read

THE COMMON CREED OF COMMON SENSE—

A 32-page pamphlet printed in large type. Send 25 cents today for your copy to

MOSES STEINBERG
1406 Knickerbocker Building N. Y. City

Wanted—A Furnished Apartment—New York City

For six months, October—May, 1925, only. 2, 3 or 4 rooms, bath, kitchen. East Side below 70's preferred, but not indispensable. For responsible tenant with best references. Address Box 123, The New Republic.

The New Reformation

Do you wish to be a standard bearer of modern religious and moral ideas?

Will you share in the new reformation which seeks to create the Kingdom of God with freedom of the spirit?

Consult the Prospectus of the

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
Meadville, Pennsylvania

Summer sessions for all students in the University of Chicago. Ample scholarships. Fellowship for graduate study in Europe.

Tuition and rooms free. Co-operative board at cost.

For information address

President F. C. Southworth,
Meadville, Pennsylvania

BROOK BEND TAVERN

all year-round house
Monterey, Massachusetts
8 miles from Great Barrington

High in the Berkshire Hills Tavern recently renovated, decorated and beautifully furnished. Steam heat and electricity. Four huge open fireplaces. Delicious home food. Suites with bath. Rates by the day, $5 and up. By the week, from $28 to $60. Address

MISS LEILA LIVINGSTON MORSE

WOMAN of education and initiative wanted by publishing house for traveling position; this is an educational sales proposition with every opportunity of advancement for the woman capable of developing into an executive; liberal drawing account and commissions; all transportation paid; do not apply unless you are sure your time is worth $75 a week. Write, stating age and experience, or apply to B. E. Sparrow (5th floor), 50 West 47th St., New York, N. Y.

Books & Autographs

Catalogues post free. Early printed books. Old English authors. Classics. Arts. First Editions, etc. R. ATKINSON, 188 Peckham Rye, E. Dulwich, S. E. London, England.

THAT BOOK YOU WANT!

We have over 1,000,000 (Secondhand and New) on every conceivable subject in stock. On approval. Also Rare Books and Sets of Authors. Catalogues free. Mention requirements. Commissions executed.

FOYLES
121 Charing Cross Road, London, Eng.

Children 2 to 5

A small group of selected children will be cared for by a modern educationalist in her own home in Ithaca, New York, from October to July. Expert attention to both physical and psychological needs. University atmosphere. Normal home life. Address Box 284, The New Republic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED